

Grace, Works, and Staying Saved in Paul*

The publication of E. P. Sanders' *Paul and Palestinian Judaism* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1977) stirred up the study of Paul's theology. Reviewers regularly noted the importance of the book (from here on, *PPJ*). One reviewer, despite his suffering the barb of Sanders' criticism, went so far as to endorse the claim on the dust cover of *PPJ* that here we have the most important work on its subject to appear in a generation⁽¹⁾. In *PPJ*, however, Sanders gave far more space to Palestinian Judaism than to Paul. Now Sanders has written another book, *Paul, the Law and the Jewish People* (from here on *PLJP*)⁽²⁾, which redresses that imbalance and enables us to take fuller and fairer account of his thoughts. Its first and third chapters "expand and clarify, and sometimes correct, the account of Paul's view of the law which was sketched in *Paul and Palestinian Judaism*"⁽³⁾. Special lectures in Europe, Great Britain, and North America have given Sanders further opportunity to broadcast his thoughts. Their growing influence on Pauline studies calls for examination.

Sanders has certainly put us in his debt. Particularly impressive to NT scholars are the breadth and depth of his discussions in *PPJ* concerning both primary Jewish materials and secondary literature (especially that stemming from modern Jewish scholarship) devoted to those materials. We should heed his call to relate the materials to each other in ways that take account of hortatory purpose as well as of theological dogma and not to seize on certain statements that appeal to Christian prejudice and neglect others which, from the Christian standpoint, put Palestinian Judaism in a better light. His striving to compare whole patterns of religion, not merely particular

* A Response to E. P. Sanders' thoughts on getting in and staying in according to Palestinian Judaism and Paul.

(1) M. McNAMARA, *JSNT* 5 (1979) 71; cf. *PPJ*, 24-29.

(2) (Fortress Press, Philadelphia 1983).

(3) *PLJP*, ix.

themes, and to do so initially with scholarly objectivity rather than with theological evaluation merit applause. Sanders may not live up to his own ideals – his comparison turns out to be not so holistic as announced and his apology for Palestinian Judaism (not just description of it) as well-balanced between God's grace and the good works of human beings⁽⁴⁾ shows some intrusion of Sanders' own theological preferences – but those ideals have enlarged and purified the descriptive task he set for himself to a larger degree than is evident in some other treatments of the same topic.

Since the bulk of *PPJ* dealt with Palestinian Judaism and a comparatively small portion with Paul's theology, most reviewers of that book followed suit. By contrast, the present evaluation deals briefly with Palestinian Judaism and at some length with Paul's theology. It also takes account of various articles written by Sanders and most especially of his *PLJP*.

Sanders excludes from the consideration of Paul's pattern of religion 2 Thessalonians, Colossians, Ephesians, the pastorals, and passages about Paul in Acts. Inclusion might strengthen certain criticisms of Sanders' thesis (see esp. Eph 2,8-9; 1 Tim 1,7; Tit 3,4-7; and possibly Acts 13,39), though the thesis might gain some points, too (e.g., from Acts 16,3; 18,18; 21,17-26; Eph 2,10; Tit 3,8). The overall picture would not alter, however; nor would it with the inclusion, on the Jewish side, of the targums and Pseudo-Philo's *Biblical Antiquities*, for the neglect of which Sanders has been criticized⁽⁵⁾.

Reviewers have regularly noted that Sanders does not, in fact, compare whole patterns of religion; rather, he compares soteriologies dealing with "getting in and staying in" (his phrase)⁽⁶⁾. He nearly

⁽⁴⁾ SANDERS, *PPJ*, 426-427.

⁽⁵⁾ N. KING, *Bib* 61 (1980) 141-144; McNAMARA, *JSNT* 5 (1979) 73; G. BROOKE, *JJS* 30 (1979) 248. The question of Christian influence in the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, which Sanders also excludes, leaves the *Testaments* in limbo. On the other hand, J. NEUSNER thinks Sanders should have shown the same reticence to use rabbinic materials because of great uncertainties concerning their dates, historical reliability, original meanings, theological redactions, etc. ("The Use of the Later Rabbinic Evidence for the Study of Paul", *Approaches to Ancient Judaism* [ed. W. S. GREEN; Brown Judaic Studies 9; Chico, CA 1980] 2, 56-59; cf. an earlier form of this article in *HR* 18 [1978-79] 177-191, there entitled "Comparing Judaisms").

⁽⁶⁾ See DAHL, *RelSRev* 4 (1978) 155-157; A. J. SALDARINI, *JBL* 98 (1979) 300; McNAMARA, *JSNT* 5 (1979) 72; BROOKE, *JJS* 30 (1979) 248;

admits as much ("one might call this pattern the soteriological pattern"), but prefers the more general term "pattern of religion" (7). This limitation to soteriologies has seemed to reduce the argumentative weight of the supposed holism of his comparisons. Furthermore, it is charged, not only has Sanders succumbed to the temptation of building too much on too little; he has also fallen prey to the danger of leaving a generally false impression of Palestinian Judaism by concentrating on its soteriology (with which the literature of Palestinian Judaism shows little concern), by disregarding the atomistic nature of rabbinic literature when it comes to soteriology, by overlooking the questions which generated rabbinic literature, by papering over differences among various sectors of Palestinian Judaism, by failing to take account of its historical developments, by playing down certain elements (in particular, apocalyptic), and by ignoring the distinction between abstract theology and lived religion (8).

In Sanders' defense, however, he does not conceive of soteriology narrowly. It covers all the essential points of religion, i.e., all the requirements for getting in and staying in. Whatever their number, these essentials include both beliefs and practices. Formally, then, Sanders' inability to discuss in the confines of *PPJ* the mass of halakic minutiae developed in Palestinian Judaism (however systematic or atomistic that development may have been) does not invalidate his description of them as soteriologically designed to help people stay in. Quite simply, those minutiae helped form the nomistic side

W. A. MEEKS, "Toward a Social Description of Pauline Christianity", *Approaches to Ancient Judaism*, 2, 27; B. R. GAVENTA, "Comparing Paul and Judaism", *BTB* 10 (1980) 39-41. Gaventa adds the objection that there are no wholes to compare, since we have only a few, occasional letters of Paul and since our knowledge of rabbinic Judaism in Paul's day is sketchy. But this objection only expresses the limits of historical research. Surely Sanders means "whole" so far as data are available.

(7) SANDERS, "Patterns of Religion in Paul and Rabbinic Judaism: A Holistic Method of Comparison", *HTR* 66 (1973) 457.

(8) J. C. BEKER, *TToday* 35 (1978) 108, 110-111; DAHL, *RelSRev* 4 (1978) 155; J. MURPHY-O'CONNOR, *RB* 85 (1978) 123; D. A. HAGNER, *The Reformed Journal* 29 (1979) 26; SALDARINI, *JBL* 98 (1979) 300, 302; McNAMARA, *JSNT* 5 (1979) 72; Brooke, *JJS* 30 (1979) 247-249; NEUSNER, "The Use of the Later Rabbinic Evidence", 43-63; W. D. DAVIES, *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism* (Philadelphia 1980) xxxi-xxxvi; cf. H. RÄISÄNEN, "Legalism and Salvation by the Law", *Die paulinische Literatur und Theologie* (ed. S. Pedersen; Teologiske Studier 7; Aarhus/Göttingen 1980) 67, n. 27.

of "covenantal nomism" (Sanders' phrase describing the pattern of religion in Palestinian Judaism).

A careful reading of *PPJ* will falsify the charges that Sanders is inattentive to the atomistic nature of rabbinic literature when it comes to soteriology, to the differences among various sectors of Palestinian Judaism, and to its historical developments. In fact, he gives a reasonable amount of attention to these matters; and in a responsive article he turns back the charge of overlooking the questions which generated rabbinic literature by noting that there must have been a pattern of religion behind those questions – otherwise Judaism would have disintegrated in the flux of time – and by arguing that the Mishnah discusses disputed points because points of agreement (i.e., those that made up the pattern of Palestinian Judaism) needed no discussion⁽⁹⁾.

Sanders affirms the importance of apocalyptic in Paul's theology even though he does not discuss it at length⁽¹⁰⁾; and his lack of emphasis on Jewish apocalyptic poses no problem unless someone can show that such apocalyptic negated covenantal nomism. He admits a partial negation of this sort in 4 Ezra, but can explain it as due to disappointment resulting from the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple in A.D. 70⁽¹¹⁾. Here, indeed, a crack opens in the

⁽⁹⁾ E. P. SANDERS, "Puzzling Out Rabbinic Judaism", *Approaches to Ancient Judaism* 2, 66-67, 70-73; cf. already IDEM, *PPJ*, 234-237, 420-421. SALLADARINI's complaint (*JBL* 98 [1979] 302) that to see the same pattern of religion in 1 Enoch, an apocalyptic book, as in Tannaitic literature is to overlook obvious differences hits the mark to the extent that a truly holistic comparison is insisted on, but not to the extent that soteriology is in view and can be shown to be similar in 1 Enoch and Tannaitic literature. In the QL, trust in elective grace and emphasis on strict observance of the law stand side by side despite the presence of interest in apocalyptic. So we have no reason to think the apocalyptic character of 1 Enoch (itself represented at Qumran) subverts the similarities between 1 Enoch and Tannaitic literature with respect to covenantal nomism. On the other hand, Sanders' argument that Weber's theory of Israel's falling from grace through worship of the golden calf is necessary to the affirmation of legalism in Judaism needs to be faulted (*PPJ*, 38; cf. F. WEBER, *Jüdische Theologie* [Leipzig 21897] 274-277). Jewish theologians of the NT era might still teach legalism without holding to such a theory.

⁽¹⁰⁾ SANDERS, *PLJP*, 12, n. 13, with references to *PPJ*, 441-442, 549, 552.

⁽¹¹⁾ SANDERS, *PPJ*, 427-428.

pattern of Palestinian Judaism. J. C. Beker tries to drive a wedge into the crack by asking why we should accept such an explanation when most of Tannaitic literature post-dates A.D. 70 yet loses nothing of covenantal nomism⁽¹²⁾. The question is not telling, however, since an historical event can evoke quite different responses among people belonging to the same religion. There is no reason why 4 Ezra may not be the exception that proves the rule. As historians of religion we want to know what *was* (as a matter of fact), not what *should* have been (as a matter of logical consistency).

So far as the distinction between abstract theology and lived religion is concerned, Sanders' emphasis on exhortation as the primary framework of nomistic language and on prayer as the primary framework of covenantal language (i.e., the language of elective grace) pays due to the importance of lived religion. D. Hagner is almost certainly correct in saying that "adherents of a religious faith seldom reflect the balance of its theology holistically conceived"⁽¹³⁾. But the suggestion that despite theoretical balance, one-sided legalism sometimes characterized the practice of Palestinian Judaism not only misses the hortatory and prayerful nature of the theologoumena cited by Sanders; it also needs literary evidence (else we cannot know whether a disparity between theology and practice did in fact develop).

Is there very much literary evidence of such a disparity? Probably not, if we exclude the NT and analyze the Jewish literature only *formally* with the question of contradiction in our minds and the handy explanation of logically loose hortatory and prayerful language in our pockets. This kind of analysis allows Sanders to state a thesis part of which the rest of the present article is written to refute: "on the point at which many have found the decisive contrast between Paul and Judaism - grace and works - Paul is in agreement with Palestinian Judaism... salvation is by grace but judgment is according to works; works are the condition of remaining 'in', but they do not earn salvation"⁽¹⁴⁾. But if we treat the literatures (the

(12) BEKER, *TToday* 35 (1978) 110; cf. B. BYRNE ("Sons of God" - "Seed of Abraham" [AnBib 83; Rome 1979] 229-230), who adds a consideration of 2 Baruch.

(13) HAGNER, *The Reformed Journal* 29 (1979) 26.

(14) *PPJ*, 543. Because for Paul Christian faith entails an active decision (whereas Jews have only to be born into the covenant) and because for Paul

Pauline and the Palestinian Jewish) *materially* – i.e., if we weigh their emphases – quite a different impression may be gained, an impression of Palestinian Judaism as centered on works-righteousness and of Paul's theology as centered on grace. Such an impression need not include theological judgments, only historical descriptions; for it is another question (though an important one) whether we ourselves should prefer legalism, grace, or a combination of the two.

Weighing the materials of Palestinian Judaism shows a preponderance of emphasis on obedience to the law as the way of staying in. The covenant, based on God's elective grace, may be presupposed; but it has no prominence (as Sanders admits)⁽¹⁵⁾. Rather, the law is searched, pulled, stretched, and applied. The rabbis start building a fence around it in order that people may not even come close to breaking it. A body of interpretative or applicatory traditions starts piling up, also a body of oral legal traditions (written down finally in the Mishnah) which parallel the written law of the OT. These traditions draw the criticism in the NT outside Pauline literature that they smother the original intent of the law (see Mark 7,6-13; par. Matt 15,3-9 for the classic passage). Whether it was Jesus or the early church that was originally responsible for the criticism and whether or not the criticism was just, the very raising of the issue establishes a Palestinian Jewish preoccupation with the law and with its careful observance and indicates a basic disagreement between Palestinian Judaism and Christianity at this point (even in sectors of Christianity where the law was valued – see, e.g., the Gospel of Matthew).

Josephus's descriptions of the Jewish sects confirm this preoccupation (*Life* 38 § 191; *J.W.* 1.5.2. § 110; 2.8.6, 9, 12, 14 §§ 136, 147, 159, 162; *Ant.* 17.2.4 § 41; 18.1.3-4 §§ 12-18), as do the contents of the Mishnah and other early rabbinic literature. J. Neusner is even

soteriology grows out of union with Christ (whereas in Palestinian Judaism it grows out of a person's relation to the law), SANDERS describes the two patterns of religion as "totally different" ("Patterns of Religion", 474-476) and "essentially different" (*PPJ*, 543). These descriptions do not fully agree with his strong insistence, however, that Paul and Palestinian Judaism agree on grace and works. Such a fundamental agreement, if proved, would weaken the adverbs "totally" and "essentially" and tend toward a view Sanders denies, viz., that the patterns are alike, only the materials different.

⁽¹⁵⁾ See, e.g., *PPJ*, 236.

able to portray the Pharisees before A.D. 70 and after Hillel as trying to extend the laws of purity concerning the temple to everyday life⁽¹⁶⁾. Much more do the rabbis after A.D. 70 set their sights on exact delineation of legal responsibilities. The punctiliousness of the sect at Qumran proves that we cannot legitimately use endtime fervor to dilute preoccupation with careful observance of the law. And whatever enjoyment Palestinian Jews derived from such observance is immaterial to the fact of this preoccupation. Sanders has succeeded in undermining the notion that in Palestinian Judaism the retention of salvation always depended on producing at least a bare majority of good deeds; but he has not succeeded in relating the law to elective grace in a way that materially scales down preoccupation with legal interpretation, extension, application, and observance.

Though obedience is integral and important to Paul's theology, alongside Palestinian Jewish absorption in legal questions his comments on obedience look proportionately slight. Furthermore, they usually take the form of exhortations, not of legal interpretation, extension, and application⁽¹⁷⁾. Where amoral questions arise (as concerning meat offered to idols in 1 Cor 8-10; cf. Rom 14), Paul tends to freedom of conscience rather than to legal definition. The moral demands of the law he takes, not as distinctive of Judaism, but as matters of universal obligation (see esp. Rom 1,18-32); therefore it would not cross his mind that commanding Gentile as well as Jewish Christians to meet these demands might disagree with his insistence on freedom from the law. In the Judaizing debate, he is concerned with specially Jewish features of the law (circumcision, "days and months and seasons and years" [Gal 4,10], and dietary restrictions)⁽¹⁸⁾, the kind that capture most attention in Palestinian Judaism. The fact he does not defend himself against inconsistency

⁽¹⁶⁾ J. NEUSNER, *From Politics to Piety* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ 1973) 14, 67, 73, 80, 83-90, 119-120, 146, 152; IDEM, *The Rabbinic Traditions About the Pharisees Before 70* (Leiden 1971) Part I, 62-65, 70, 304-307; Part II, 295; Part III, 244, 286-300. Cf. W. HORBURY's criticism of Sanders for neglecting tendencies in Palestinian Judaism to "moral absolutism and asceticism" (*ExpTim* 90 [1979] 116-118).

⁽¹⁷⁾ Cf. SANDERS, *PLJP*, 95-96, 106-107; P. STEENSGAARD, "Erwägungen zum Problem Evangelium und Paränese bei Paulus", *ASTI* 10 (1975/76) 110-128.

⁽¹⁸⁾ SANDERS, *PLJP*, 104.

suggests that even his opponents took the moral and ethical demands of the law as matters of universal obligation rather than as specially Jewish requirements⁽¹⁹⁾.

As noted, Sanders sees an in principle agreement between Paul and Palestinian Judaism: a person gets in by God's elective grace and stays in by works of the law. But for Paul, of course, God's elective grace works through Christ. Sanders' view therefore requires us to think that after defining in an un-Jewish, Christological way the grace that gets a person in, Paul lapses back to his inherited Jewish, un-Christological way of thinking with regard to staying in: "Christians are judged according to how well they fulfill the law" and will be excluded if they do not fulfill it well enough⁽²⁰⁾. "When he had to deal in detail with transgression within the Christian community, reward and punishment, and the possibility of postconversion atonement, he did so in a thoroughly Jewish way"⁽²¹⁾. This view of Paul's thought implies that the question of staying in was not a theological point of debate between him and the Judaizers; for otherwise we would have expected him to carry over his un-Jewish thinking from getting in to staying in so as to avoid a charge of inconsistency and keep the focus of his soteriology on faith in Christ.

In fact, however, the question of staying in *is* the issue, at least the primary one, in Galatians. There, contrary to Sanders' statement that "the subject of Galatians is... the condition on which Gentiles enter the people of God"⁽²²⁾, Paul does not deal with a

⁽¹⁹⁾ Cf. C. HAUFE, "Die Stellung des Paulus zum Gesetz", *TLZ* 91 (1966) 171-178; P. BLÄSER, *Das Gesetz bei Paulus* (NTAbh 19/1-2; Münster 1941) 38-44; P. STUHLMACHER, "Das Gesetz als Thema biblischer Theologie", *ZTK* 75 (1978) 271-276.

⁽²⁰⁾ SANDERS, *PLJP*, 112; see again *PPJ*, 543, and almost identical statements on pp. 517, 518; also *PLJP*, 10. SANDERS' statement that Paul opposes obeying the law as the condition of remaining among the elect ("Paul's Attitude Toward the Jewish People", *USQR* 33 [1978] 184) seems to contradict these other, repeated statements.

⁽²¹⁾ SANDERS, *PLJP*, 107.

⁽²²⁾ SANDERS, *PLJP*, 17-20. Sanders describes the point as "absolutely vital". Taking the issue as one of getting in rather than as one of staying in enables him to say that in Galatians Paul is not arguing against Judaism in general, but against a position concerning a particular point advocated in Christian circles (*PLJP*, 19-20). But if Paul's opponents took their cue from Judaism and if the issue had to do with staying in, Paul's remarks hit against Judaism *via* his opponents' Judaistic false gospel (as Sanders admits in *PLJP*,

question whether believing Gentiles had *gotten* in; rather, he deals with the question whether believing Gentiles could *stay* in without submitting to circumcision and keeping other parts of the law. "Having begun by the Spirit, are you now being perfected by the flesh?" (3,3). It is a question of "abiding", not of starting, according to Paul's quotation of Deut 27,26 (3,10). "You have been severed from Christ, you who are seeking to be justified by law; you have fallen from grace... You were running well; who hindered you from obeying the truth?" (5,4,7). Someone might say that the Judaizers were concerned with the question of getting in – thus they did not regard Gentile believers as "in" – and that Paul, regarding Gentile believers as already in, transposed the question to one of staying in. Apart from the unlikelihood that he was badly misinformed or knowingly and foolishly misrepresented his opponents' position, his view of the question determines his response, which we want to understand. So it does not matter to *his* theology whether his understanding of the Judaizers' soteriology was accurate or not. Since for him staying in was the question, it is hard to think he lapsed back – perhaps carelessly, perhaps inconsistently – into Jewish thinking with respect to continuing in the Christian life. Even in the less polemical Romans, staying in by faith in Christ seems to be as much on Paul's mind as getting in; for he devotes chaps. 6–8 to the ongoing life of believers as being not under law, but under grace; and whatever else the phrase "from faith to faith" in 1,17a may mean, it surely means that from beginning to end, faith alone (which Paul expressly contrasts with works – see esp. 4,4–5) forms the overarching principle of soteriology, staying in as well as getting in. Similarly, we read in Rom 11,20, "You stand by faith", and in 15,18, "For I will not presume to say anything [except] those things that Christ has accomplished through me".

Outside Galatians and Romans, too, Paul repeatedly identifies faith and rejects works as the principle of continuance in salvation; he repeatedly affirms the activity of God and denies human effort as the fundament of perseverance. Human effort is an effect, not a cause. "For you stand by faith" (2 Cor 1,24). "Not that we are adequate in ourselves so as to consider anything as [coming] from ourselves, but our adequacy is from God" (2 Cor 3,5). "Being con-

46, though as usual he limits Paul's criticism to privileged status – a limitation we will later find reasons to reject).

fident of this very thing, that he who has begun a good work in you will perfect it until the day of Jesus Christ" (Phil 1,6). "Work out your salvation with fear and trembling, for it is God who effects in you both the willing and the doing for his good pleasure" (Phil 2,12b-13). "We... put no confidence in the flesh... I count [N.B. the present tense after the preceding perfect tense "I counted"] all things to be loss... and I count [them] rubbish in order that I should be found in him, not having my righteousness from the law, but the [righteousness] through faith in Christ, the righteousness from God, [based] on faith" (Phil 3,3.8-9). Likewise in disputed epistles: "Striving according to his working which works in me with power" (Col 1,29); "being established by the [probably = 'your'] faith" (Col 2,7); "that Christ may dwell in your hearts through faith" (Eph 3,17). Cf. 2 Cor 4,7.10; 12,9; 13,4; Eph 2,10; 6,10⁽²³⁾.

⁽²³⁾ Cf. K. T. COOPER, "Paul and Rabbinic Soteriology", *WTJ* 44 (1982) 137; and the comments on a different but related topic by E. SYNOFZIK, *Die Gerichts- und Vergeltungsaussagen bei Paulus* (Göttinger Theologische Arbeiten 8; Göttingen 1977) 59-61. Sanders does not believe, of course, that "faith stopped functioning after entry" (*PLJP*, 114). In a letter to me dated Dec. 3, 1981, he says, "I need to sharpen the formulation and clarify the point... I did not intend to imply that 'entry' is only momentary. There is nevertheless a distinction between an entry requirement (what is necessary in order to be considered a member *at all*) and behavioural requirements within the group. Circumcision, I think, is the former in the Galatians debate. When considered in the latter category, it is a matter of indifference (*Gal.* 6.15; I Cor. 7.19), as are 'days' and food (Rom. 14.1-6)". These words and longer statements in *PLJP*, 20, 52 (n. 20), 159, represent a basic shift rather than the sharpening and clarification of an original point. For it used to be in Sanders' view that getting in was solely by God's elective grace in both Paul and Palestinian Judaism. Now Sanders is saying that getting in requires circumcision in Palestinian Judaism and among Christian Judaizers; otherwise a person cannot be considered a member at all. It used to be in Sanders' view that for both Paul and Palestinian Judaism, keeping the law was only the means of staying in. Now Sanders is saying that at least one aspect of keeping the law - viz., submitting to circumcision - is a means of getting in for Palestinian Judaism and Christian Judaizers, whereas Paul goes in the opposite direction by making circumcision a matter of indifference. It seems that the fundamental and original thesis that Paul and Palestinian Judaism were at one on getting in by grace and staying in by obeying the law has broken down. In effect, Sanders now admits that Jews and Judaizers were synergists on the topic of getting in, and that at least on the question of circumcision Paul was not a synergist even with respect to staying in, let alone with respect to getting in.

Paul did not dispute with the Judaizers because he thought they taught that believing Gentiles had to be circumcised and start keeping the rest of the law as means of getting in, then. In *PPJ* Sanders himself showed that, strictly speaking, not even non-Christian Palestinian Judaism represented such a view (and if it did – i.e., if circumcision was considered a good work by which Gentiles earned entry – his view that the circumcision of Jews was not so considered would look questionable). Instead, entering the covenant preceded taking the yoke of the commandments; thus, Gentile proselytes entered the covenant by indicating their acceptance of it and their intention to obey the commandments in it, and circumcision and similar acts that followed constituted evidence rather than means of entry⁽²⁴⁾. We can hardly suppose, then – and Paul gives us no reason to suppose – that the Judaizers in the church taught that believing Gentiles had to be circumcised and start keeping the rest of the law to get in; on the contrary, he battles against circumcision and keeping the rest of the law as necessary to stay in, i.e., against *falling* from grace, not against failure to enter it (Gal 5,4).

At the same time he demands good works, and Sanders appeals to this demand. But Paul's un-Jewish extension of faith and grace to staying in makes good works evidential of having received grace through faith, not instrumental in keeping grace through works⁽²⁵⁾. This extension also means we cannot accept Sanders' view that Paul's attacks on the Judaizers' teaching are to be explained simply as a dogmatic denial: Judaism (and therefore the Judaizing element in the church) is wrong because it is not Christianity⁽²⁶⁾. On the

⁽²⁴⁾ SANDERS, *PPJ*, 206-212; cf. 85-101.

⁽²⁵⁾ Cf. E. JÜNGEL, *Paulus and Jesus* (Tübingen 1967) 66-70. We may partly agree with Sanders that in Paul "good deeds are the *condition* of remaining 'in', but they do not *earn* salvation" (*PPJ*, 517; IDEM, *PLJP*, 114). On the other hand, the condition must be evidential rather than instrumental if it is to stand beside Paul's much stronger emphasis on staying in by faith, not by works. Therefore, the view that those professing Christians whose sin is so serious, prolonged, and unforsaken that they apparently lose their salvation never really had it in the first place looks like a fair extrapolation from Paul's thinking (see esp. 2 Cor 13,5-6; cf. Matt 7,23; 1 John 2,18-19). This issue will later occupy our attention.

⁽²⁶⁾ So SANDERS' understanding of Paul (*PPJ*, 550-552 *et passim*; IDEM, *PLJP*, 27, 47). He stresses Paul's "exclusivist soteriology" so one-sidedly that he thinks Paul's own, emphatic, and extended formulation "by faith and

contrary, Paul attacks the Judaizers' teaching as a *corruption* of grace and faith (again see Gal 3,3.10; 5,4.7). For Paul, then, getting in and staying in are covered by the seamless robe of faith as opposed to works, with the result that works come in as evidential rather than instrumental. Sanders' bisection of getting in and staying in cuts a line through Paul's religion where the pattern shows a whole piece of cloth.

Paul's insistence on faith rather than on law for staying in as well as getting in raises the question, Why did he regard law and faith as excluding each other? In what respect did he consider them incompatible? Sanders offers an answer limited to salvation-history: "God's will to save by Christ is changeless... the law was *never* intended by God to be a means of righteousness. It is not only *lately* that it has come to an end as such"⁽²⁷⁾. But an historical intention of God that salvation should *always* be by faith in Christ for all people, Gentiles as well as Jews, does not explain why Paul can speak of faith as "coming" late in history (Gal 3,23-29), why he can speak of the salvation of Gentiles as an only recent historical development (see esp. Rom 11,11-32), why he can assume that faith and the law were compatible in the OT (not only was Abraham justified by faith prior to the law, but also David was justified by faith *during the period of law* - Rom 4,1-8), or why Paul can say that "the righteous ordinance of the law should be fulfilled in us, who walk not according to the flesh but according to the Spirit" (Rom 8,4)⁽²⁸⁾. Apparently there is something about the law in human experience as illustrated in Palestinian Judaism that is incompatible with faith, whereas the law as originally given by God and as now immersed in the Spirit and revised in accordance with Christ's coming, the hardening of Israel, and the grafting in of Gentiles is not incompatible with faith⁽²⁹⁾. Statements that speak of fulfilling the law imply the new work of the Spirit; statements such as "faith

not by works... actually misstates the fundamental point of disagreement [with Judaism and Judaizing]" (PPJ, 551).

⁽²⁷⁾ SANDERS, *PLJP*, 85-86 (his italics); so also 47.

⁽²⁸⁾ On Paul's expecting Christians to fulfill the law, see SANDERS, *PLJP*, 93-122.

⁽²⁹⁾ Paul does not, however, carefully and consciously distinguish the revisions. See the well-balanced comments by SANDERS, *PLJP*, 97-105.

came" (Gal 3,23) and "you are not under the law, but under grace" (Rom 6,14.15) reflect failure of the law in past human experience.

Where in past human experience does the incompatibility of the law with faith lie? We are forced back to an answer Sanders rejects: for Paul, the incompatibility lies in the self-righteousness to which unbelievers who try to keep the law succumb. Sanders counters that we find Paul's main objection to Jewish self-righteousness, not in self-dependent pride of accomplishment, but in the Jews' dependence on their status as God's covenant people who possess the law and in their consequent missing of the better righteousness based solely on believing participation in Christ, not on having the law: "what is wrong with Judaism is not that Jews seek to save themselves and become self-righteous about it, but that their seeking is not directed toward the right goal. . . They do not know that, as far as salvation goes, Christ has put an end to the law and provides a different righteousness from that provided by Torah obedience (Rom. 10.2-4)"⁽³⁰⁾. Thus the difference between Jewish righteousness and God's righteousness in Christ "is not the distinction between merit and grace, but between two dispensations. There is a righteousness which comes by law, but it is now worth nothing because of a different dispensation. . . It is this concrete fact of *Heilsgeschichte* which makes the other righteousness wrong. . ." ⁽³¹⁾.

To be sure, Paul sees a shift in dispensations. But he sees more than that. The key-passage Phil 3,2-11 starts with his boasting in the givens of Jewish status ("as to circumcision, an eight-dayer; from the stock of Israel; of the tribe of Benjamin"), but it climaxes with confidence in personal accomplishments ("a Hebrew of the Hebrews; as to the law, a Pharisee; as to zeal, persecuting the church; as to the righteousness in the law, having become blameless"). Salvation-history does not account for all that Paul says, much less for the passion with which he says it; we are dealing with an autobiographical as well as a dispensational shift. Sanders admits that in Phil 3,2-11 Paul makes personal accomplishments as well as the givens of Jewish status the objects of his former confidence in the flesh;

⁽³⁰⁾ SANDERS, *PPJ*, 550.

⁽³¹⁾ SANDERS, *PLJP*, 140. Pages 137-141 deal with the shift in dispensations. To avoid a developmental view of *Heilsgeschichte*, "salvation-history", SANDERS also refers to God's "plan of salvation" (*PLJP*, 26-27, 55, n. 50).

but he argues that Paul does not charge himself with "the attitudinal sin of self-righteousness". Rather, "he [had] put confidence in something other than faith in Jesus Christ"⁽³²⁾. "The only thing that is wrong with the old righteousness seems to be that it is not the new one; it has no fault which is described in other terms"⁽³³⁾. But a long list of items in Phil 3,2-11 points to the attitudinal sin of self-righteousness alongside the mistake of missing God's righteousness in Christ: (1) "boast"; (2) "have confidence"; (3) "*think* (δοκεῖν) to have confidence"; (4) "to me (μοι)" in connection with "gain"; (5) "I regard"; (6) Paul's setting out his past achievements as superior to the achievements of his opponents who boast in the flesh – as though there is a contest over who can boast the most; (7) his following denial that he now "considers" himself to have arrived (vv. 12-16); and (8) his exhortation to be similarly "minded (φρονῶμεν)" (v. 15). These attitudinal elements show that "self-righteousness" accurately expresses an important feature of Paul's thought. Zeal for the law was good, but not the self-righteousness that followed. That self-righteousness was wrong both in itself and in its being a hindrance to accepting God's righteousness through faith in Jesus Christ.

That a dispensational shift does not by itself account for all Paul says is evident also in his parade example, Abraham; for he, according to Paul, was justified by faith long before Christ ushered in the new dispensation (Gal 3; Rom 4). David is just as troublesome to Sanders' purely salvation-historical explanation; for Paul has David, too, justified by faith (Rom 4,6-8) – yet David lived not only long before the new dispensation, but also right within the old dispensation of law. With regard to Abraham and David, Sanders suddenly drops *Heilsgeschichte*:

It seems to me to be a mistake to read Romans 4 as implying the continuous, or at least sporadic, existence of people of faith between Abraham and Christ. David (4:6) is not cited as a second historical person who also had faith, but rather a psalm (traditionally attributed to David) is quoted which pronounces a blessing on those who have faith. Abraham is immediately returned to (4:9), and he continues to be employed in a typological way⁽³⁴⁾.

⁽³²⁾ SANDERS, *PLJP*, 44.

⁽³³⁾ SANDERS, *PLJP*, 139-141.

⁽³⁴⁾ SANDERS, *PLJP*, 62, n. 125.

The modern critical view that Davidic authorship of Ps 32 is only traditional, not actual, has no relevance. On Paul's lips "David says" means that the historical David pronounced the following beatitude. Only by having Paul exclude David and David's contemporaries from the beatitude – an unlikely and certainly unstated qualification which goes against the autobiographical character of Ps 32 – could Sanders escape the implication that people of faith existed between Abraham and Christ. Furthermore, Paul thinks chronologically, not just typologically, concerning Abraham, the law, and justification by faith (Gal 3,15-18).

Since Paul's own righteousness had included works accomplished as well as status granted, we must say that his opposing the works of the law to faith in Christ includes an attack on self-dependence as well as an indication of dispensational shift. What Paul says about Abraham in Rom 4,2,4 supports the point: "for if Abraham was justified by works, he has ground for boasting... to the one who works the reward is not reckoned according to grace, but according to debt" (contrast Pr Man 8; *Jub.* 23,10; m. *Kidd.* 4,14)⁽³⁵⁾. Sanders tries to avoid the force of these statements by noting that in fact the reward was given to Abraham on the basis of faith and that Paul neither mentions nor criticizes an attempt by Abraham to be justified by works⁽³⁶⁾. Nevertheless, Paul's statements imply that Abra-

⁽³⁵⁾ The intervening words, "but not before God", do not imply that justification by works would have enabled Abraham to boast before his fellow men (against RÄISÄNEN, "Legalism and Salvation by the Law", 70). Rather, "but not before God" prepares for the scriptural citation of Gen 15,6 in v. 3 (which opens with the connective γάρ, "For") and interprets the passive verb in the statement, "And it [Abraham's believing God] was reckoned to him for righteousness", as the action of God himself (which amounts to his denying that Abraham was justified by works and had any ground for boasting). If Abraham's fellow human beings come into view at all, Paul is implying that they would set up a system of justification by works contrary to God's way of justification. The suggestion that "but not before God" calls attention to the impropriety of human boasting before God, no matter how good one's works might be (so H. HÜBNER, *Das Gesetz bei Paulus* [FRLANT 119; Göttingen 1978] 99-100), does not establish a good base for the following γάρ-clause. See further C. E. B. CRANFIELD, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans* (ICC; Edinburgh 1975) 1, 228.

⁽³⁶⁾ SANDERS, *PLJP*, 33-34. Sanders notes the expressions "law of works" (3,27) and "the one who works" (4,4), but by-passes them in favor

ham *could* have boasted if his justification *had* come by works. Paul's ruling out even the possibility of Abraham's having been justified by works which he could have boasted about shows that self-dependence as well as salvation-history has come into view.

Sanders recognizes that according to Paul "it was never... God's intention that one should accept the law in order to become one of the elect"⁽³⁷⁾. "It has always been by faith"⁽³⁸⁾. Well, then, so far as God's intention is concerned, salvation-history did not shift from righteousness which comes by law to God's righteousness in Christ (as Sanders self-contradictorily says in his attempt to load everything on Paul's notion of salvation-history)⁽³⁹⁾, but from promise to fulfillment (cf. Gal 3-4). The use of the law to establish one's own righteousness is what Paul finds wrong in Palestinian Judaism, including his past life.

Rom 9,30-10,13 comes into play here. Sanders admits that "at first blush" and taken alone 9,30-32 means that Israel failed to fulfill the law because they rested on works rather than on faith. But the rest of the passage, Sanders argues, identifies the reason for this failure, not with a wrong manner of trying to fulfill the law (works instead of faith), but with lack of faith in Christ, so that "their own righteousness" (10,3) means "that righteousness which the Jews alone are privileged to obtain" rather than "self-righteousness which consists in individuals' presenting their merits as a claim upon God"⁽⁴⁰⁾. We may agree that Paul blames Israel for lack of faith in Christ. But to make that lack displace rather than complement wrong dependence on one's own works fails to carry conviction. Sanders is reduced to saying that in 9,31 Paul uses νόμος a second time even though he means "the righteousness of God which comes by faith in Christ", that this use is "certainly curious", and that "Paul did not say precisely what he meant" but "the desire for a

of expressions concerning status: "Jews" (3,29); "the circumcision" (3,30; 4,9.12); "those of the law" (4,14.16). Yet the textual data require a both - and rather than an either - or.

⁽³⁷⁾ SANDERS, *PLJP*, 46.

⁽³⁸⁾ SANDERS, *PLJP*, 33-34.

⁽³⁹⁾ SANDERS, *PPJ*, 550-551 ("He [Paul] simply saw the old dispensation as worthless in comparison with the new"); IDEM, *PLJP*, 140-141.

⁽⁴⁰⁾ SANDERS, *PLJP*, 36-38; cf. WRIGHT, "The Paul of History and the Apostle of Faith", *TynBul* 29 (1978) 82-83.

balanced antithesis [νόμος having just occurred for the Mosaic law] led Paul to an almost incomprehensible combination of words". Sanders then draws a parallel with 8,10⁽⁴¹⁾. But in 8,10 Paul achieves balance with pairs of antonyms: "body" vs. "Spirit", "dead" vs. "life" (the problem here lies in the inconcinnity of adjective vs. noun, which has no bearing on 9,31), and "sin" vs. "righteousness"; whereas Sanders asks us to believe that in 9,31 the *same* word "law" refers in one breath to the Mosaic law, in the next breath to the righteousness of God which comes by faith in Christ.

Another view is preferable. Paul's speaking of faith in 9,32 looks like a contrast with νόμον in the sense of law; indeed, the strongly adversative ἀλλ' ὡς ἐξ ἔργων, "but as [if it were] by works", confirms this contrast and interprets νόμον in v. 31 as the law used for works-righteousness. Otherwise the question, "Why [did they not attain it]?" and its answer, "Because [they did] not [pursue it] by faith, but as [if it were] by works", makes doubtful sense; for if the second occurrence of νόμον in v. 31 means the righteousness of God by faith, Paul has *already* (in the first phrase of v. 31) told why Israel did not attain it: they were pursuing the law. As it is, the contrast in pursuing but not attaining requires that the object be the same: thus νόμον has one referent, the law; and the second occurrence of νόμον has no qualifier attached because the qualifier attached to the first occurrence – viz., "of righteousness" – carries over. The verb ἐφθασεν means "attained", not "fulfilled", says Sanders⁽⁴²⁾. But "attained" in the sense "achieved" comes out to much the same as "fulfilled". The verb κατέλαβεν means "took hold of" and, by virtue of synonymous parallelism, determines a similar meaning for ἐφθασεν. Therefore, we do best to understand Paul as saying that Israel pursued the law as a way of establishing self-righteousness but, because of sin (cf. esp. 2,1–3,23), failed to attain it⁽⁴³⁾. In view of the statement that it is Gentiles who have

⁽⁴¹⁾ SANDERS, *PLJP*, 42; cf. the less exegetical discussion on pp. 155–158.

⁽⁴²⁾ SANDERS, *PLJP*, 42.

⁽⁴³⁾ SANDERS' strongest argument against this understanding – viz., the argument that Phil 3,6.9 shows righteousness by the law to be attainable (*PLJP*, 43–45) – rests on failure to recognize that Paul there speaks from the standpoint of a false human estimate: "If anyone else *thinks*... I more"

taken hold of righteousness (v. 30), Paul probably chooses ἔφθασεν to indicate not only that Israel did not arrive at all, but also that Israel did not arrive *first* (the basic meaning of φθάνω), i.e., ahead of the Gentiles.

At 10,3 the infinitive "to establish" in the phrase "seeking to establish their own [righteousness]" and the contrast with subjection to God's righteousness show that it is not pride of privilege so much as self-reliance Paul is objecting to. Yet again, in 10,5 it is performance rather than privilege which contrasts with faith: "for Moses writes that the one who *does* [ποιήσας] the righteousness which is from the law will live by it". And in 10,8 Paul's *dropping* "that you may do it" from his quotation of Deut 30,14 concerning "the word of faith" favors the view that here faith contrasts with the Jewish attempt to perform the law, not with Jewish privilege in having the law.

Sanders tries to blunt the argument from Rom 10,5 by saying that the immediately following verses show Paul to be in disagreement with Moses: life (eternal life in Paul's view) comes only by faith and confession, not by doing the law⁽⁴⁴⁾. But a possible disa-

(v. 4b). He is not implying that except for the better righteousness in Christ, God would have been satisfied with Paul's righteousness. Paul's rhetorical contest with the Judaizers determines his taking the standpoint of a false human estimate. Against Sanders, understanding "my righteousness" as "my individual righteousness" does not depend on a conflation with Rom 3,27; 4,2; for right within Philippians 3 the phrases "according to [the] law, a Pharisee; according to zeal, persecuting the church; according to the righteousness in [the] law, having become blameless" point to individual performance alongside Jewish status. Sanders admits as much in his statement, "Paul says that his former confidence in the flesh was partly in status... and partly in accomplishment..." (PLJP, 44). Understanding "law of righteousness" in Rom 9,31 as "the law which promises a righteousness to be attained by faith" (so C. T. RHYNE, *Faith Establishes the Law* [SBLDS 55; Chico, CA 1981] 98-102, with appeal to Rom 3,21-4,25) would not substantially alter the argument against Sanders' denying a criticism of the Jews' manner of pursuit. Nevertheless, "seeking to establish their own righteousness" in 10,3 favors understanding 9,31 as "pursuing the law for self-righteousness".

(44) E. P. SANDERS, "On the Question of Fulfilling the Law in Paul and Rabbinic Judaism", *Donum Gentilicum* (New Testament Studies in Honour of David Daube; ed. E. Bammel *et al.*; Oxford 1978) 106-107; PLJP, 41 ("Moses [according to Paul] was incorrect when he wrote that everyone who fulfills the law will 'live'").

greement with Moses is immaterial. The point remains that in this verse and throughout the surrounding passage Paul sets faith against attempted performance of the law for righteousness, not only against unbelief. Moreover, in view of his high view of scriptural authority and in view of his earlier defenses of the law (Rom 3,31; 7,7-14; 9,30-33), a disagreement with Moses seems unlikely; Paul probably thought Moses' statement was theoretically true but, because of human depravity, practically impossible (cf. the exposé of Jewish failure to keep the law and the lumping of Jews with Gentiles as sinners in Rom 2,1-3,23)⁽⁴⁵⁾.

We conclude, then, that Paul is not criticizing the Jews' unbelief in Christ *instead of* their attempt to perform the law, but that he is criticizing their unbelief *as caused by* an attempt to perform the law. That attempt leads to self-righteousness, but not because of any fault in the law itself or in obedience as such. Rather, boasting corrupts Spirit-less obedience to the law. Such obedience ends in man-made religion (if it does not already arise out of man-made religion). The law itself, however, is Spiritual (Rom 7,14 – πνευματικός, related to the Holy Spirit in Paul's usage and therefore capitalized here in English translation), so that Spiritual believers naturally fulfill the righteous ordinance of the law (Rom 8,4). The same Spirit that determines their conduct determined the precepts of the law. And no true believer is un-Spiritual (Rom 8,9; hence, prolonged carnality calls in question a profession of faith – see esp. Gal 5,19-24). In view of Sanders' discussion, it may be too much to say that in Palestinian Judaism good works were always thought to earn God's favor according to a bookish weighing of merits. But in view of the many passages in Palestinian Jewish literature that Sanders cites concerning atonement by good works⁽⁴⁶⁾, it is not too much to say that in Paul's presentation of Palestinian Judaism good works constitute a righteousness necessary at least to activate God's grace for the forgiveness of sins⁽⁴⁷⁾. Paul will have none of this synergism. For

⁽⁴⁵⁾ Cf. J. MURRAY, *The Epistle to the Romans* (NICNT; Grand Rapids 1965) 2, 249-251. There is no need to deny Sanders' point that Paul was concerned to give Jews and Gentiles equal access, by faith, to God's righteousness.

⁽⁴⁶⁾ See the pages cited under "Atonement" in the subject-index of *PPJ*.

⁽⁴⁷⁾ See W. L. LANE, "Paul's Legacy from Pharisaism: Light from the Psalms of Solomon", *Concordia Journal* 8 (1982) 130-138.

him, salvation is *wholly* by grace through faith. Whether written by him or not, Eph 2,8-10 expresses his conviction perfectly. Good works do not activate God's grace when they are enough (however little or much might be enough – Sanders rightly points to lack of systematization in Palestinian Jewish passages dealing with this question⁽⁴⁸⁾); instead, good works are an outgrowth of the new creation in Christ.

Paul is not content to argue that trying to keep the law is incompatible with faith. He takes unbelieving Jews and Christian Judaizers on their own terms and argues also that trying to keep the law never turns out to be successful. This failure of the Jews is the point of Rom 2,1-3,23, which leads into the detailed explanation of justification by faith in 3,24-5,21⁽⁴⁹⁾. In support of Sanders, N. T. Wright argues that "Paul's accusations are not against legalism, but against sin, the breaking of the law"⁽⁵⁰⁾.

They are against breaking the law, yes; but Paul levels his accusations (whether he borrows them or constructs them himself) in order to puncture Jewish boasting in the law. Such boasting arises from legalism. Sanders, seconded by Wright, argues back that this boasting does not have to do with merits, what we would call self-righteousness based on keeping the law, but with a special relation to God⁽⁵¹⁾, as in Rom 2,17-20,23a. But Paul's contextual exposé of the Jews' disobedience to the law keeps him from saying they boast in their obedience. To avoid appearing to contradict himself, he says only that they boast in the law, in God, etc. It is simply assumed they boast in the law because they think they keep it well enough. As we have already noted, Rom 4,2 clearly shows that boasting includes works of obedience as well as pride of possession: "for if Abraham was justified by works, he has a ground of boasting" (cf. Phil 3,4,6). Sanders is correct to deny that for Paul obedience to the law is bad, but wrong in denying Paul's criticism that such obedience has led to the sin of pride.

⁽⁴⁸⁾ SANDERS, *PPJ*, 125-147.

⁽⁴⁹⁾ See U. WILCKENS, *Rechtfertigung als Freiheit* (Neukirchen-Vluyn 1974) 79-84.

⁽⁵⁰⁾ WRIGHT, "The Paul of History and the Apostle of Faith", 82.

⁽⁵¹⁾ SANDERS, *PLJP*, 32-35; Wright, "The Paul of History and the Apostle of Faith", 82.

According to Sanders, however, the inconsistency and unconvincingness of Paul's statements concerning universal sinfulness show that he posited justification by faith before thinking of universal sinfulness rather than that he reached justification by faith as a conclusion based on universal sinfulness⁽⁵²⁾. We might quibble with Sanders over his opinions that Paul is inconsistent and unconvincing. Sanders seems to miss Paul's meaning in Rom 5,12-14 that death reigned prior to the law, not because all people between Adam and Moses sinned for themselves apart from the Mosaic commandments, but because they sinned in Adam's disobedience to the commandment not to eat from the tree of knowledge; i.e., Adam's original sin was imputed to them (see esp. 5,19a). If Sanders' hypothesis that in 1,18-2,29 Paul draws on a Jewish synagogue sermon which serves his purpose to show the equality of Jews and Gentiles under God's judgment and that he does so even though the sermon presupposes that some people do keep the law satisfactorily, not only does the inconsistency with Paul's own view that nobody keeps the law satisfactorily turn into a mere side-effect of his drawing on the sermon, but also the hyperbole in his statements in chap. 3 concerning universal sinfulness is more easily recognized as showing the strength of his appeal to the need for justification by faith. In the end, however, it does not matter whether in Paul's mind universal sinfulness came before justification by faith or vice versa, or whether the two occurred to him simultaneously. The fact remains that he includes Jews with Gentiles as law-breakers in order to undermine legalistic dependence on the law and thereby support justification by faith.

Sanders also argues that in the early chapters of Romans Paul is not attacking legalism, but is trying to put Jews and Gentiles on an equal footing so as to establish faith as a universal way of salvation instead of the law as a peculiarly Jewish way⁽⁵³⁾. But could there not have been equality *under the law* for Jews and Gentiles? Why should not Paul have seen equal footing for Gentiles if they, like proselytes to Judaism, submitted to circumcision and tried to keep the rest of the law on coming into the church? Sanders answers by pointing to Gal 2,14 as indicating that Paul did not think Gentiles were able to live by the law⁽⁵⁴⁾. But Gal 2,14 says nothing of the

⁽⁵²⁾ SANDERS, *PLJP*, 35-36; cf. 123-135.

⁽⁵³⁾ SANDERS, *PPJ*, 490-491; cf. IDEM, *PLJP*, 29-30 *et passim*.

⁽⁵⁴⁾ SANDERS, *PPJ*, 496.

sort. The question of ability does not come in. Paul makes only a factual statement that Cephas, a Jew, is living like the Gentiles rather than like the Jews; and he asks why Cephas is trying to force Gentiles to live like Jews.

Elsewhere the question of ability does arise, but with particular reference to *Jews*. Whether Paul or someone else, the "I" in Rom 7,7-25 is under the law and therefore must be Jewish. At least the "I" must *include* the Jew. This "I" despairs over inability to keep the law. Whether the despair is *ex post facto* (as Sanders thinks)⁽⁵⁵⁾ or reflects a feeling at the time of the experience, the fact itself of Jewish inability to keep the law remains⁽⁵⁶⁾. So Paul strengthens his attack on works-righteousness by calling attention to Jewish inability not to sin as well as to the actuality of Jewish sinning. Sanders attributes the passion of Rom 7,7-25 "partly" to Paul's desire to exonerate God from intending the law to bring sin and from having

⁽⁵⁵⁾ SANDERS, *PPJ*, 442-443.

⁽⁵⁶⁾ For a full discussion, see R. H. GUNDRY, "The Moral Frustration of Paul Before His Conversion: Sexual Lust in Romans 7:7-25", *Pauline Studies* (Essays presented to Professor F. F. Bruce; ed. D. A. HAGNER and M. J. HARRIS; Grand Rapids 1980) 228-245. This discussion includes a consideration of Acts 22,3; Gal 1,13; and especially Phil 3,4-6, which implies only that it is possible to keep the law perfectly from the standpoint of outward observance, not that it is possible to be sinlessly perfect in obedience to the law (pp. 233-234). It should be added to the discussion that Paul's putting *πάντων* with *ἐπιθυμίαν* in Rom 7,8 does not favor the wide definition of lust as including all kinds of sin. In view of his using the plural *ἐπιθυμίας*, "lusts", in 1,24 and detailing different kinds of sexual lusts (prostitution and homosexual behavior – adultery probably goes without saying) in the immediately following verses, "every lust" in 7,8 more likely refers again to different kinds of sexual lust. The "lusts" in 1,24 are clearly sexual ("uncleaness... dishonoring their bodies among themselves" in the rest of the verse; "dishonorable passions... their females exchanged their natural function for that which is contrary to nature; and likewise also the males, abandoning the natural function of the female, burned in their desire for one another, males with males committing indecency" in vv. 26-27). Furthermore, these lusts, being sexual, do not summarize the other sins previously mentioned (ungodliness, unrighteousness, failure to glorify God, unthankfulness, vain reasonings, darkened hearts, and idolatry), but result from those sins ("therefore [διό] God gave them over to the lusts of their hearts"). Verse 25 again identifies the cause as idolatry, and vv. 26-27 again identify the result as sexual immoralities.

given a law that brought death⁽⁵⁷⁾. But where did the rest of the passion come from? And the passion in the passage relates directly to human inability, not to God's honor: "Wretched man that I am! Who will rescue me from the body of this death?" (v. 24). At the end of his discussion, Sanders betrays the weakness of his position by saying, "We must back away from strict exegesis of Romans 7 to understand Paul's thought".

The Jews and Judaizers would presumably take as much encouragement as possible in their successes (as Paul expressly does from his past Judaistic standpoint in Phil 3,5-6) and take care of their failures with repentance and forgiveness⁽⁵⁸⁾. But according to Paul, obedience would have to be total to be successful in establishing one's own righteousness before God. For Paul, apparently, the fact that repentance and forgiveness have to take up the slack caused by disobedience shows the inadequacy of works-righteousness. Thus he will not allow the law to be divided, as though a person could work up sufficient righteousness by keeping part of the law but not the rest: "for as many as are of the works of the law are under a curse; for it is written, 'Cursed is everyone who does not abide by all things written in the book of the law, so as to do them'" (Gal 3,10, with a quotation of Deut 27,26). Sanders thinks Paul chose to quote Deut 27,26 because only here does the LXX connect "law" with "curse"; that therefore Paul's emphasis falls on those words, not on the word "all", which only happens to appear; and finally that the weight of Paul's argument rests in the quotations of Gen 15,16 and Hab 2,4 (Gal 3,8.11), since the further quotation of Lev 18,5 in v. 12 shows the law to be wrong because it does not rest on faith, not because it is impossible to fulfill the law completely. The quotation in Gal 3,10 is designed, then, as a sidelight "to discourage Gentiles from accepting circumcision"⁽⁵⁹⁾, for "failure to fulfil the law perfectly leads to damnation by the law; while true life *cannot in any case* come by obedience to the law, even if the obedience is faultless"⁽⁶⁰⁾.

⁽⁵⁷⁾ SANDERS, *PLJP*, 76-81, 124.

⁽⁵⁸⁾ SANDERS, *PPJ*, passim.

⁽⁵⁹⁾ SANDERS, *PPJ*, 483; cf. IDEM, *PLJP*, 17-27.

⁽⁶⁰⁾ SANDERS, "On the Question of Fulfilling the Law", 105-106; cf. IDEM, *PLJP*, 152.

But should we shunt aside Gal 3,10 as an "even if", a mere spur alongside the main track of Paul's argument? A whole train of considerations favors that we should not. Sanders lays down the principle that it is not the OT quotations that tell us what Paul means, but Paul's own words that tell us what he took the OT quotations to mean; then Sanders notes that in his own words Paul mentions only the curse which comes on those who accept the law⁽⁶¹⁾. For the sake of argument let us accept Sanders' principle and ask whether Paul's own words are in fact limited to the curse. The answer is no. Paul starts introducing the quotation with the words, "For as many as are of the *works* of the law". If he has in mind merely acceptance of the law, we would have expected a reference only to the law, not to the works of the law. "Works" shows that he has in mind performance, which relates to the bulk of the quotation, "everyone who does not continue in all things written in the book of the law, so as to do them"⁽⁶²⁾. The large amount of space he devotes in Rom 2,1-3,23 to Jewish failure to abide by everything in the law confirms this observation.

Furthermore, and as Sanders himself notes elsewhere⁽⁶³⁾, within the quotation of Deut 27,26 Paul takes from the LXX the verb ἐμμένει, "abides by", which requires legal perfection, rather than giving a more accurate translation of the Hebrew *yāqīm*, "confirms", which requires only a basic intention to keep the law. This point gains in strength from the fact that in several other respects he does *not* follow the LXX of Deut 27,26.

Yet again Paul returns to the question of performance in v. 12: "but the law is not of faith; rather, 'the one who does them [the things written in the law] will live [ζήσεται, which for Paul means to have eternal life] by them' [Lev 18,5]". Is Paul pitting Hab 2,4, which he quotes in the preceding verse for righteousness or eternal life by faith, against Lev 18,5 and disagreeing with the Mosaic statement?⁽⁶⁴⁾ Though he might have changed opinion between epis-

⁽⁶¹⁾ SANDERS, *PLJP*, 20-22.

⁽⁶²⁾ Cf. D. J. MOO, "'Law,' 'Works of the Law,' and Legalism in Paul", *WTJ* 45 (1983) 90-99.

⁽⁶³⁾ SANDERS, *PPJ*, 137.

⁽⁶⁴⁾ It does not matter to the present argument whether in Gal 3,11b we attach "by faith" to "the one who is righteous" or to "will live". Either way, faith contrasts with doing the law.

ties⁽⁶⁵⁾, his defense of the law in Romans casts doubt on an affirmative answer (cf. the foregoing comments on Rom 10,5). The interest in the question of performance evident in Gal 3,10 ("works of the law" and "abides by") substantiates the doubt. More probably, Paul quotes Hab 2,4 to show that in fact faith underlies righteousness or eternal life and quotes Lev 18,5 to show that eternal life might have come through complete obedience to the law⁽⁶⁶⁾. Then, in v. 13, he returns to the theme of the curse which comes because of a breakdown in obedience. Since according to v. 10 the curse falls on the one who fails to abide by everything in the law, Paul's statement "Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law" clearly implies that it is failure to abide by everything in the law which necessitates faith in Christ's redemptive work. Otherwise Paul has no reason to bring up the curse again. Thus non-performance lies on the main track, not on a spur, of his argument; and his argument is not that eternal life *could* not come *even though* a person perfectly obeyed the law, but that eternal life *does* not come *because* a person obeys the law only imperfectly⁽⁶⁷⁾.

Final confirmation comes from Gal 5,3, which, Sanders admits, "shows that, although Paul quoted Deut. 27:26 for the connection of 'curse' and *nomos*, he did not forget that it said 'all'"⁽⁶⁸⁾: "But I testify again to every man who is circumcised [or 'gets himself circumcised'] that he is a debtor to do the whole law". We may note first that these are Paul's own words, which therefore show what he

⁽⁶⁵⁾ HÜBNER, *Das Gesetz bei Paulus*, has recently stressed the differences between Galatians and Romans. But see U. LUZ, *TZ* 35 (1979) 122-123, that the differences have been overestimated and that too much theological significance has been read into those that do exist.

⁽⁶⁶⁾ See HÜBNER, *Das Gesetz bei Paulus*, 39-42, though his explanation that "quantitative Erfüllung ist nicht möglich, weil die Torah Bestimmungen besitzt, die 'qualitativ erfüllt' werden müssen" does not carry conviction.

⁽⁶⁷⁾ See U. WILCKENS, "Zur Entwicklung des paulinischen Gesetzverständnisses", *NTS* 28 (1982) 166-169 et passim; IDEM, *Rechtfertigung als Freiheit*, 84-94; IDEM, *Der Brief an die Römer* (EKK 6/1; Köln/Neukirchen-Vluyn 1978) 93, 178-180, 201, 233-243. Despite the criticisms of G. KLEIN, "Sündenverständnis und theologia crucis bei Paulus", *Theologia Crucis - Signum Crucis* (FS. E. Dinkler; ed. C. ANDERSEN and G. KLEIN; Tübingen 1979) 249-282, Wilckens is correct in seeing the importance of concrete transgressions in Paul's thought.

⁽⁶⁸⁾ SANDERS, *PLJP*, 27.

got from the quotation of Deut 27,26 in Gal 3,10. Secondly, the adverb "again" (πάλιν, which is not to be omitted with D* G 1739 pc it goth arm) shows that he is indeed reflecting on the earlier passage. And the accusation in Gal 6,13, "For not even those who are getting circumcised keep the law themselves", shows that he is contrasting incomplete performance, such as mere submission to circumcision, with complete performance.

According to Sanders, however, Paul infers that accepting circumcision entails accepting the whole law, "not to argue that the law should not be accepted *because* all of it *cannot* be kept, but as a kind of threat: if you start it *must* all be kept". Sanders goes on:

To make this support the view that Paul argues against the law because it is impossible to keep all of it quantitatively, one must make a long list of assumptions about Paul's and the Galatians' presuppositions about the law: one must keep it all; one cannot do so; there is no forgiveness of transgression; therefore accepting the law necessarily leads to being cursed. The middle terms of this thought-sequence are never stated by Paul, and this sequence of views cannot be found in contemporary Jewish literature⁽⁶⁹⁾.

Actually, these presuppositions need be only Paul's, not the Galatians' as well. The first, that one must keep all the law, is not an assumption on our part, but Paul's outright statement in Gal 5,3 (cf. 3,10, too, and the foregoing discussion of it). The second, that one cannot keep all the law (in fact, *does* not keep all the law suffices for the argument in Galatians⁽⁷⁰⁾), is hardly missing. We have seen that Gal 3,13a compared with 10 clearly implies such failure, that Gal 6,13 states it outright, that Rom 2,1-3,23 details it, and that Rom 7,7-25 adds pathos to it⁽⁷¹⁾. Moreover, Gal 5,17-21, which comes not very far after the verse presently in question, indicates that without the Spirit a person does not avoid the works of the flesh, which will prevent the inheriting of God's kingdom. The third presupposition, that there is no forgiveness of transgression, is put wrongly; rather, Paul adopts the earlier Christian view that Jesus' vicarious death (therefore not our obedience to the law) takes care of trans-

⁽⁶⁹⁾ SANDERS, *PLJP*, 27 (his italics).

⁽⁷⁰⁾ See the foregoing discussion, p. 20.

⁽⁷¹⁾ These passages in Romans cast doubt on the view that Paul writes in a quantitative vein in Galatians, but switches to a qualitative vein in Romans (as HÜBNER says in *Das Gesetz bei Paulus*, 76-80).

gression; and he does not leave this presupposition unstated (see Gal 3,13; cf. Rom 3,23-25; 4,25; 5,6-10; 1 Cor 15,3; 2 Cor 5,21; Gal 1,4). Thus the "middle terms" *are* stated by Paul; and for *his* theology it makes no difference whether or not they can be found in contemporary Jewish literature. As Sanders does not deny, the fourth presupposition, that accepting the law necessarily leads to being cursed, appears in the text (Gal 3,10). G. Howard has argued from the word order in the Greek text that "debtor" rather than "the whole law" receives the emphasis⁽⁷²⁾. "Debtor" does indeed receive emphasis; but so also does "the whole law" because of its position before the infinitive "to do", whereas in 3,10, to which Paul is harking back, "to do" has its object following. It stands fast, then, that Gal 5,3 confirms the necessity and failure to keep the whole law as a main feature of Paul's argument for justification by faith alone.

But the argument does not stop at the law's failure to help people produce sufficient righteousness of their own; Paul twists the screw harder by saying that the law actually increases sin (Gal 3,19.22; Rom 5,20; 6,15-16; 7,5-6.7-25, esp. 13; 11,32). Since Sanders does not dispute the point, but affirms it⁽⁷³⁾, we have only to ask how he can deny that the unfulfillability of the law poses a major problem to Paul. Why does Paul attempt this tour de force of saying the law *increases* sin if not even inability to keep it perfectly troubles him? It appears that the twin pillars of human weakness and salvation-history, not just salvation-history, uphold justification by faith alone. To counter that Paul's thinking runs from the solution in Christ to the human plight, so that Paul's anthropology is only a reflex effect of his Christian soteriology⁽⁷⁴⁾, makes the

⁽⁷²⁾ G. HOWARD, *Paul: Crisis in Galatia* (SNTSMS 35; Cambridge 1979) 14-17.

⁽⁷³⁾ SANDERS, *PLJP*, 70-71. HÜBNER, *Das Gesetz bei Paulus*, 71-76 (cf. WILCKENS, "Zur Entwicklung...", 182-183), does dispute the point so far as Romans is concerned. His strongest argument – viz., that the singular of τὸ παράπτωμα, "the transgression", in Rom 5,20 points away from increased sinning on the part of individual human beings and toward an increase in the transsubjective rule of sin – comes to grief in chap. 6, where the transsubjective rule of sin works out in individual sinning (see, e.g., the exhortation in v. 12: "Therefore do not let sin reign in your mortal body with the result of obeying its lusts [plural!]").

⁽⁷⁴⁾ SANDERS, *PPJ*, 442-447, 474-511; IDEM, *PLJP*, 68, 125. RÄISÄNEN,

strength of his emphasis on the lordship of sin using the law and the pathos in his description of life under that lordship hard to explain adequately. Sanders does not appreciate these problems enough, but emphasizes corresponding problems in seeing a development from plight to solution⁽⁷⁵⁾. We should call in question that there was any development, in either direction. The problems suggest that Paul thought simultaneously rather than consecutively of plight and solution.

But as Paul's soteriology needs balancing by the lordship of sin in his thinking, so the lordship of sin needs balancing by the forensic meaning of justification and the concept of sin as guilt which that meaning implies. As is popular to do nowadays, Sanders stresses the power of sin more than the guilt of sin as the quintessence of Paul's hamartiology⁽⁷⁶⁾; thus justification denotes transferal from

"Legalism and Salvation", 69, singles out Gal 2,21 as the strongest support for the view that Paul rejected the law for a Christological rather than an anthropological reason; but P. GARNET, "Qumran Light on Pauline Soteriology", *Pauline Studies*, 29-31, points to a slightly earlier statement in Gal 2,15 as indicating that the human problem precedes the Christological solution. For a modern example of psychological turmoil over failure to keep the law perfectly, see the autobiographical statement of the Jewish scholar E. RIVKIN in his book *A Hidden Revolution: The Pharisees' Search for the Kingdom Within* (Nashville 1978) 22.

(75) SANDERS, *PLJP*, 68-70, 81, 138, 149-154. It is hard to understand why Sanders thinks the universality of sin implies that Paul thought backwards, from solution to plight. Why could not Paul have thought that since all need salvation, Christ came to save all? According to Gal 2,15-16, SANDERS argues, Paul "knows full well that observant Jews are not in fact sinners by the biblical standard" (*PLJP*, 68, in reference to Paul's mentioning "Jews" who are "not sinners from [the] Gentiles"). But because of the contrast with "Jews", the term "Gentiles" rather than the phrase "not sinners" receives the emphasis, as is confirmed by the emphatic position of ἐξ ἐθνῶν before ἁμαρτωλοί, against normal word order. Paul's formal use of the Jewish epithet "sinners" for Gentiles does not imply that he did not regard Jews, too, as sinful (cf. Rom 2,1-3,24; 7,7-25). We may appreciate, even endorse, SANDERS' argument for rhetorical exaggeration in Rom 1,18-3,23; 7,7-25 (see *PLJP*, 123-135). But his deduction that such exaggeration is due to Paul's moving from solution to plight does not follow. We might equally well say that Paul uses rhetorical exaggeration because of his preoccupation with the human plight. In fact, such a view would make it easier to understand the rhetorical flights, which gain rather than lose pathos in the hyperbole Paul uses.

(76) Much modern psychology views guilt as an incapacitating complex.

sin's lordship to Christ's lordship more than an exchange of guilt and righteousness between the believer and Christ⁽⁷⁷⁾. But in Galatians Paul introduces justification as the solution to the problem of transgressions, which cause the law to bring a curse. Only then does bondage come into his discussion; and even so, primarily bondage to false religion (4,1-10.21-5,1), only secondarily to sinning (3,22; 5,17-21)⁽⁷⁸⁾. This pattern repeats itself in Romans: the problem of guilt comes first, reaching a climax in 3,19-23; forensic justification follows in 3,24-5,19; only later come the classic passages dealing with sin's lordship (5,20-8,17). See also 1 Cor 6,9-11; 2 Cor 5,21.

It is not satisfactory to pass off the earlier passages as merely traditional and undistinctive of Paul's thought. He spends too much papyrus on guilt and on its replacement with Christ's righteousness. Sanders rightly calls attention to the possibility of substituting "life" and "Spirit" for "righteousness" in Rom 6,16; Gal 3,3.6.21⁽⁷⁹⁾. But this possibility in no way negates or scales down the forensic element. Since union with Christ makes possible the exchange of guilt and righteousness (see esp. Phil 3,7-11), Paul naturally mixes the forensic benefit of that union, "righteousness", with other benefits (cf. the mixture of forensic language, "one died for all", with participatory language, "therefore all died", in 2 Cor 5,14)⁽⁸⁰⁾. Furthermore, since death is the penalty for sin (Rom 5,12-21; 6,15-23), it is only natural that Paul should associate life in the Spirit, who gives life, with the forensic negation of that penalty (Rom 8,1-2). The

Though this view may have alerted us to sin as an incapacitating power in Paul's theology, it may also have dulled many of us to sin as objective guilt in his theology. Adding moral relativism to such a psychological view of sin insures a theological devaluation of objective guilt. This devaluation carries with itself, of course, a corresponding devaluation of the propitiatory or expiatory value of Jesus' death. To the extent psychology is a natural science it is merely descriptive and lacks the capacity to address moral questions.

⁽⁷⁷⁾ SANDERS, "Patterns of Religion", 470-474; IDEM, *PPJ*, 502-508.

⁽⁷⁸⁾ Against SANDERS, "Patterns of Religion", 478.

⁽⁷⁹⁾ SANDERS, "Patterns of Religion", 470-474.

⁽⁸⁰⁾ G. CAIRD, *JTS* ns 29 (1978) 541-542, calls attention to 2 Cor 5,14 and criticizes Sanders for failing to analyze what "participation" means and for failing to take seriously the metaphorical nature of Paul's juristic language. We may wonder, however, whether CAIRD'S interest in figurative language (see his book *The Language and Imagery of the Bible* [Philadelphia 1980]) leads him to underestimate the degree to which Paul intended his juristic language to express the state of affairs itself, not an analogy to it.

benefits of union with Christ are not equivalent to each other; they accompany each other and are distinguished from each other (cf. Rom 5,17-21; 8,1-11).

Sanders objects that even in Rom 1,18-3,23 Paul does not reach the conclusion "guilty"; rather, "under sin" (3,9)⁽⁸¹⁾. But how can we read about the inexcusability of pagans in the latter half of chap. 1, about the inexcusability of Jews in chap. 2, about the accountability of Jews and pagans alike in 3,19, and about propitiation or expiation in Christ's blood and the passing over of sins committed beforetime (3,25) without taking "under sin" as referring to sin that brings guilt as well as (or perhaps at this point in Romans, more than) sin that brings bondage? The time is surely past when we could think, as Sanders wants us to, that the lack of the term "guilty" (ἔνοχος, which Paul uses only once and non-soteriologically in 1 Cor 11,27) means that Paul was not exercised by the *idea* of guilt. James Barr has not done his work for nothing⁽⁸²⁾.

Certainly, illegitimate sexual unions contradict union with Christ (1 Cor 6,12-20; 10,1-22). But Paul warns against other sins which by their nature have nothing to do with union (e.g., thievery, covetousness, drunkenness, reviling, and rapaciousness in 1 Cor 6,10 – the list could grow longer with additions from Gal 5,20-21 and other passages). And why should he be so concerned about the lordship of sin if not for the reason that sinning brings guilt? Otherwise not even certain sexual unions would contradict union with Christ. It is simply untrue to say Paul never presses his participatory language into the service of his juristic language as he sometimes presses his juristic language into the service of his participatory language (for the latter see Gal 3,21, where "righteousness" appears instead of the expected "life", and Rom 6,7, where "justified from sin" has the contextual meaning "set free from the domination of sin"). In Gal 5,16-24 participation in Christ and the Spirit serves the warning against the works of the flesh. The fact that Paul describes the contrasting fruit of the Spirit as that "against which there is no law" reveals a juristic frame of reference to which the language of walking by the Spirit and belonging to Christ is bent. Similarly, where union with Christ in Rom 6,1-11 would lead us to expect a recapitula-

⁽⁸¹⁾ SANDERS, *PPJ*, 503.

⁽⁸²⁾ J. BARR, *The Semantics of Biblical Language* (London 1961) 35-45 *et passim*.

tion of that idea in v. 14, which supports the intervening exhortation (vv. 12-13), Paul is not content to stop with the statement, "For sin shall not lord it over you" (v. 14a), but locates the ultimate ground of his exhortation in a juristic theologoumenon: "for you are not under law, but under grace" (v. 14b). And instead of reading that in Christ there is liberation from the lordship of sin, as we would expect from Rom 7,7-25, we read in 8,1 the juristic statement that there is "no condemnation" to those who are in him⁽⁸³⁾. Not till

⁽⁸³⁾ Rom 8,1 harks back to Rom 5,16.18, where *κατάκριμα* does not refer to the lordship of sin over conduct, but to the sentence of death and its execution because of the one sin of Adam. In 8,1, then, Paul is reminding his readers of the reversal for those who are in Christ Jesus of the condemnation they had had in Adam. The argument that "condemned sin" in 8,3-4 means "broke the power of sin in human conduct", because the condemnation was something the law could not do whereas the law certainly could, and did, condemn sin in the sense of pronouncing judicial sentence against it – this argument overlooks the possibility that the inability of the law has its counterpart, not in God's condemning sin in the flesh, but in the *ἵνα*-clause concerning the fulfillment of the righteous ordinance of the law. God's condemning sin in the flesh would then lay the juristic foundation for the superstructure of freedom from sin's lordship.

The argument that the inferential *ἄρα*, "then", in v. 1 relates "condemnation" to the preceding discussion of sin's lordship rather than to guilt is overrated. We can see a tight connection drawn with the preceding context by *ἄρα οὖν*, "therefore then", in 7,25. But here in 8,1 Paul drops *οὖν*. As a result, *ἄρα* draws only a loose connection, probably with earlier discussions of forensic justification, especially the one in chap. 5, the only preceding passage in Romans where *κατάκριμα* has occurred. The *γάρ*-clause in v. 2 does indeed talk of deliverance from sin's lordship (described in 7,7-25). In so doing it does not define "condemnation" in v. 1; rather, it makes deliverance from sin's lordship a sign or evidence of the judicial pronouncement "no condemnation". The *γάρ*-clause in v. 3 starts with the same purpose, but returns in its second half to the judicial aspect, grounded in Jesus' sacrifice for sin.

God's sending his son in the likeness of sinful flesh and as a sin-offering defines God's condemning sin in the flesh much more easily (these expressions all occur in the same clause in relation to each other) than does the subsequent *ἵνα*-clause concerning the fulfillment of the righteous ordinance of the law. That fulfillment gives the purpose, not the definition, of God's condemning sin in the flesh and makes up for the inability of the law. Some commentators, admitting the well-known use of *περί ἁμαρτίας* for "sin-offering" in the LXX, shy away from it here with a generalizing interpretation which they fail to support with counter-evidence. The phrase is so frequent

v. 2 does Paul write about liberation, but he immediately goes back to juristic language in the phrases "as a sin-offering", "condemned sin", "righteous ordinance of the law" (vv. 3-4). In short, the dynamics of union with Christ are pressed into the service of forensic justification as well as vice versa⁽⁸⁴⁾.

But if juristic thinking marks Paul's theology deeply, why does he not write more about atonement, repentance, and forgiveness?⁽⁸⁵⁾ He may not write very much (we shall see this), and at least some of what he does write comes from early Christian tradition. But in addressing the already converted he can, in the main, assume that tradition. Atonement, repentance, and forgiveness need not be any the less foundational to his theology or important to his thinking for being traditional. (Sanders should be the first to grant the principle behind this statement, since in Palestinian Judaism the covenantal side of nomism admittedly gets little attention in the literature but, according to his interpretation, has fundamental importance)⁽⁸⁶⁾. In fact, when citing the tradition concerning Christ's death "for our sins" Paul describes the tradition "as of first importance" (1 Cor 15,3). Whether traditional or not, the statement concerning propitia-

in the LXX for sin-offerings, however, that we need powerful reasons not to accept this meaning in Rom 8,3. The bond between "condemned sin in the flesh" and *περὶ ἁμαρτίας* gives us a positive reason to accept it (cf. 2 Cor 5,21); a general meaning "for sin" or "to deal with sin" would be superfluous in the context. Therefore, eliminating v. 1 (usually along with 7,25a) as an alien juristic gloss does not leave the way clear to see only a discussion of liberation from sin's power and to deny a reminder of liberation from the guilt of sin (against R. BULTMANN, *Exegetica* [Tübingen 1967] 279, and others in his wake; cf. H. HÜBNER's complaint ["Pauli Theologiae Proprium", *NTS* 26 (1980) 468-469] that Sanders separates the juristic and the participatory too much).

⁽⁸⁴⁾ Therefore it is hard to accept Sanders' waving aside 1 Cor 6,9-11, which he recognizes to be non-participatory, as hortatory (*PPJ*, 498, 500). It would be truer to say that the levitical and juristic language of the passage provides the firm foundation of Paul's exhortation. See BYRNE, "Sons of God", 231-233, and COOPER, "Paul and Rabbinic Soteriology", 135, on the interdependence of juristic and participatory categories and their eschatological framework.

⁽⁸⁵⁾ SANDERS, *PPJ*, 497-508.

⁽⁸⁶⁾ See esp. the response to Neusner in SANDERS, "Puzzling Out Rabbinic Judaism", 72-73; also IDEM, *PPJ*, 234-237, 420-421.

tion or expiation in Rom 3,25 comes at a crucial juncture in his argument, viz., at the point of transition from sin to justification. Paul hardly needs to cite a juristic tradition here if he is mainly concerned about the power, not the guilt, of sin. Furthermore, this juristic tradition, if tradition it is and not Paul's own words, agrees with his emphasis on the inexcusability of sin in 1,18-3,23⁽⁸⁷⁾; with further statements in 4,7-8.25; 5,6-11; 8,3.32; 14,15 (most of which are obviously juristic and the rest of which are most naturally taken so); with his doctrines of the imputation of sin and, where there is faith, the imputation of righteousness in 5,12-19; and with his delaying a discussion of the lordship of sin till 5,21 and the following chapters. Even Sanders admits that the juristic statements in 2 Cor 5,11-21 belong to Paul⁽⁸⁸⁾. When we add to these 1 Cor 5,7; 11,24-25; Gal 1,4; 2,20; 3,13; 1 Thess 5,10 (cf. Eph 2,13; Col 1,20), Paul's supposed lack of interest in the juristic value of Christ's death looks false. Two recent studies by H. Ridderbos and J. D. G. Dunn strengthen this verdict⁽⁸⁹⁾.

On the other hand, repentance and forgiveness, which are prominent in Palestinian Judaism, do not appear so often in Paul as atonement does (but see Rom 2,4-5; 4,6-8; 2 Cor 3,16; 7,9-10; 1 Thess 1,9-10). Why not? Sanders offers the reason: Paul was too interested in the problem of sin's lordship, for which repentance and forgiveness provide no solution but for which union with Christ and

⁽⁸⁷⁾ The point stands whether or not we accept Sanders' thesis that much of Rom 1,18-3,23 stems from Jewish homiletical tradition, for Paul would at least be using such tradition to stress the inexcusability of sin.

⁽⁸⁸⁾ SANDERS, *PPJ*, 502-503.

⁽⁸⁹⁾ H. RIDDERBOS, "The Earliest Confession of the Atonement in Paul", and J. D. G. DUNN, "Paul's Understanding of the Death of Jesus", both in *Reconciliation and Hope* (NT Essays on Atonement and Eschatology presented to L. L. Morris; ed. R. BANKS; Grand Rapids 1974) 76-89, 125-141. See also R. H. GUNDRY, *Sōma in Biblical Theology* (SNTSMS 29; Cambridge 1976) 204-216; P. STUHLMACHER, "Achtzehn Thesen zur paulinischen Kreuzestheologie", *Rechtfertigung* (FS E. Käsemann; ed. J. FRIEDRICH *et al.*; Tübingen/Göttingen 1976) 512-514; IDEM, "Zur paulinische Christologie", *ZTK* 74 (1977) 455-460. S. KIM, *The Origin of Paul's Gospel* (WUNT 2/4; Tübingen 1981) 276-277, n. 3, criticizes Dunn for playing down the penal, substitutionary character of Jesus' death in Paul's theology after having presented good evidence for it.

receiving his Spirit do provide a solution⁽⁹⁰⁾. Here Sanders is partly right. Repentance does not sound a Christological note as faith, which has Christ as its object, does. Nor does forgiveness in comparison with justification, which entails an exchange of guilt and righteousness between the believer and Christ. But Sanders misses the boat in thinking Paul favored the Christologically oriented terms and avoided the Judaistic terms purely for the dogmatic reason that Christianity is not Judaism. Rather, as we have seen, Paul so deeply felt the falling short of God's glory through sin that he did not think trying to keep the law, *let alone repenting to receive forgiveness for failures to keep it*, adequate. The more the law abets sin's lordship because of human weakness, the less adequate is repentance to take care of guilt; *for repentance implies a change of behavior*.

For this same reason Paul cannot ascribe atoning value to good works. Juristically, Christ's self-sacrifice makes them unnecessary and, by comparison, inferior. Dynamically, sin's lordship, exercised through the law, frustrates efforts to keep the law well enough to make atonement. Despite his very full discussions of atonement by good works in Palestinian Judaism⁽⁹¹⁾, Sanders neglects to emphasize how differently Paul thinks of atonement. This neglect grows out of a mistaken belief that Paul has little concern over the question of guilt. A greater appreciation of just such a concern enables us to understand his rejection of Judaism better.

Even Paul, however, says that in the end people will be judged according to their works. Sanders, citing Rom 2,12-16; 11,22; 14,10; 1 Cor 3,10-13; 4,2-5; 6,9-10; 10,21; 11,29-32; 2 Cor 5,8-10; Gal 5,21, uses such statements to argue that on the question of staying in Paul holds fast the Jewish mode of thinking, according to which avoiding evil works and doing good works are the condition of staying in, but do not earn salvation⁽⁹²⁾. "The point is that God

⁽⁹⁰⁾ SANDERS, "Patterns of Religion", 468-469; IDEM, *PPJ*, 499-501, 507, 549-551.

⁽⁹¹⁾ See "Atonement" in the subject-index of *PPJ*. With regard to Paul's view of staying in, SANDERS thinks 1 Cor 3,5-4,6; 5,1-5; 11,27-34; and 2 Cor 12,21 indicate a belief in atonement through repentance and the suffering of punishment by the Christian who has sinned (*PLJP*, 107-109). But Paul does not use the language of atonement in these passages, only that of discipline; the language of atonement he reserves for Christ's death alone.

⁽⁹²⁾ SANDERS, *PPJ*, 515-518; IDEM, *PLJP*, 113-114. See also *PLJP*, 123-135, esp. 125-126, for a retraction of Rom 2,12-16 from this point.

saves by grace, but that *within* the framework established by grace he rewards good deeds and punishes transgression"⁽⁹³⁾.

But we cannot afford to let this apparent similarity between Paul and Palestinian Judaism go unscrutinized. Again it is necessary to recall that whatever else Paul's phrase "from faith to faith" may mean in Rom 1,17, it surely means that salvation continues as well as starts on the principle of faith alone, which, as Paul makes clear, excludes works (see Rom 4,4-5 for the most explicit statement; cf. 11,17-22). And we have already noted that his letter to the Galatians, which emphasizes faith instead of works, deals more with staying in than with getting in. So we have to ask whether in Paul's doctrine of judgment according to works synergism has watered down the doctrine of grace or whether the danger is false profession (so that loss of salvation is only apparent) rather than the negating of a salvation genuinely received. The evidence Sanders cites from Palestinian Jewish literature shows overwhelmingly that good works are a condition as well as a sign of staying in. It appears, however, that for Paul good works are only (but not unimportantly) a sign of staying in, faith being the necessary and sufficient condition of staying in as well as of getting in. Not only do we have the phrase "from faith to faith" and the whole Epistle to the Galatians; Paul expresses his thought unambiguously in 2 Cor 13,5: "Test yourselves whether you are in the faith; prove yourselves. Or do you not recognize concerning yourselves that Jesus Christ is in you unless indeed you are disapproved [ἀδόκιμοι]?" In particular, the words "Test yourselves" point to evidence rather than means. Paul goes on to talk of doing good and not evil (v. 7). Thus good works are a way of proving the genuineness of salvation. There is no need to make Paul contradict himself by deducing that he regards good works as a *means* of retaining salvation⁽⁹⁴⁾.

Contrastingly, the rabbis make varying and sometimes contradic-

⁽⁹³⁾ SANDERS, *PPJ*, 543; cf. K. P. DONFRIED, "Justification and Last Judgment in Paul", *ZNW* 67 (1976) 92-103.

⁽⁹⁴⁾ Cf. H. RIDDERBOS, *Paul* (Grand Rapids 1975) 178-181. Failure to observe the distinction between good works as evidence of salvation retained as well as received solely by faith and good works as a means of retaining salvation received by faith underlies H. RÄISÄNEN'S seeing an incoherence at this point in Paul's thought ("Paul's Theological Difficulties with the Law", *Studia Biblica* 1978, III. *Papers on Paul and Other New Testament Authors* (ed. E. A. LIVINGSTONE; JSNTSup 3; Sheffield 1980) 307.

tory statements about merit and the weighing of fulfillments and transgressions at the last judgment⁽⁹⁵⁾. (Some rabbis even rested God's election of Israel on the merit of the patriarchs, of Israel at the exodus, or of Israel in the future)⁽⁹⁶⁾. Sanders takes these statements as unsystematically hortatory rather than as contrary to grace. Even so, the rabbis' mixing of merit-language and grace-language makes synergism an applicable designation and stands in sharp opposition to Paul's avoiding all talk of merit, indeed, denying merit outright.

Everyone recognizes that judgment according to works provides Paul a basis of exhortation, and that his affirmations of justification by faith, not by works, are theological, even polemically so. But his waxing polemical on the doctrine casts a shadow on Sanders' insistence that works-righteousness in Palestinian Judaism was only a hortatory device, not a soteriological principle as well (which, combined with elective grace, produces synergism). Are we to prefer Paul's interpretation or Sanders'? Paul was closer. He had been a zealous proponent of Palestinian Judaism. His statements not only comment on others in Palestinian Judaism, but also reflect on the nature of his own participation in it (Gal 1,13-14). To be sure, he converted to Christianity; but conversion does not necessarily blind a person to past realities; so we are not at liberty to say Paul misconstrued his own experience of Judaism⁽⁹⁷⁾.

It is hard to imagine Paul, despite his call to obey the commandments he thinks Christians are obligated to obey, as engaging in the careful attempts to define the commandments exactly and, further, to "build a fence" around them by adding regulations in order to keep people from even coming close to breaking them⁽⁹⁸⁾. Sanders interprets such attempts on the part of the rabbis as growing out of sincere desire to please God. Well and good. But Paul's

⁽⁹⁵⁾ SANDERS, *PPJ*, 125-147; cf. BYRNE's remark ("*Sons of God*", 230-231) that "in *practice*... works are a means of gaining salvation" in Judaism.

⁽⁹⁶⁾ SANDERS, *PPJ*, 87-101.

⁽⁹⁷⁾ For merit theology in Palestinian Judaism, see D. A. CARSON, *Divine Sovereignty and Human Responsibility* (Atlanta 1981) 49-53, 68-74, 78 (in part), 89-92, 104-121.

⁽⁹⁸⁾ Cf. SANDERS, *PLJP*, 95-96, 106-107. Saldarini, *JBL* 98 [1979] 300, notes that "halaka is not derived from covenant in any concrete way in Tannaitic literature; it is itself central and primary". As a result of the rabbis' preoccupation with legal minutiae, CAIRD wonders whether their religion

failure to follow the rabbinic pattern reveals a world of difference between him and the rabbis: they show much more confidence in human nature than he does⁽⁹⁹⁾. He is far less sanguine. His dependence on the Holy Spirit relates to this malism and forestalls the need for scholastic definition and protection of the commandments.

Sanders tries to counteract a relatively sanguine estimate of human nature in Palestinian Judaism by stressing the language of unworthiness and dependence on God's grace that we find especially in Jewish prayers *to* God, as opposed to descriptions *of* God, where the language of justice, reward, and punishment prevails⁽¹⁰⁰⁾. But Paul characteristically stresses God's grace in speaking *of* him (the references are too numerous to list). Furthermore, in the literature of Palestinian Judaism the people of God are typically called "the pious" and "the righteous" – terms that point to good conduct; but in Paul's letters, "the believers", "the called", and "the saints" – terms that reflect God's grace⁽¹⁰¹⁾. Despite some formal similarities, then, Paul and Palestinian Judaism look materially different at the point of grace and works⁽¹⁰²⁾.

We may conclude that Paul rejected Judaism and Judaistic Christianity not only because of a conviction that God had revealed his Son Jesus in him (Gal 1,15-16) – after all, he could have preached Christ as the messianic establisher of the law – but also because of a conviction that works-righteousness lay at the heart of

"was not *in toto* at the third remove from principles which are central to Christian theology" (*JTS* ns 29 [1978] 539).

⁽⁹⁹⁾ See CARSON, *Divine Sovereignty*, 92-93.

⁽¹⁰⁰⁾ See, e.g., SANDERS, *PPJ*, 395.

⁽¹⁰¹⁾ "The saints" emphasizes divine consecration rather than holy living, though, of course, holy living stems from such consecration. Presumably Paul might have used the Jewish terms, too, had they not in his view become overlaid with legalistic connotations. The QL forms a partial exception to typical Jewish usage (see G. L. CARR, "The Provenance of the Term 'Saints': A *religionsgeschichtliche* Study", *JETS* 24 [1981] 107-116).

⁽¹⁰²⁾ This judgment runs opposite that of M. D. HOOKER, "Paul and 'Covenantal Nomism'", *Paul and Paulinism* (Essays in honour of C. K. Barrett; ed. M. D. HOOKER and S. G. WILSON; London 1982) 47-56. She agrees with Sanders that Paul and Palestinian Judaism look similar at the point of grace and works, and uses that agreement to argue against Sanders that the patterns of religion therefore look similar despite the intrusion of Paul's "participation theology".

Judaism and Judaistic Christianity and that it would corrupt what he had come to believe concerning God's grace in Jesus Christ⁽¹⁰³⁾.

Westmont College
955 La Paz Road
Santa Barbara, CA 93108
U.S.A.

R. H. GUNDRY

SOMMAIRE

Pour l'essentiel, cet article prend la défense de E. P. Sanders contre les critiques faites sur sa manière de traiter du judaïsme palestinien. Par contre, il met en question sa manière de traiter de Paul et en particulier l'opinion de Sanders selon laquelle pour Paul quelqu'un demeure dans l'alliance par ses œuvres et donc que la différence entre Paul et le judaïsme palestinien concerne seulement le Christ et n'a rien à voir avec une différence entre le rôle de la grâce et celui des œuvres. Selon cet article, Paul dénie tout rôle aux œuvres. Il leur donne un rôle de témoignage et fait remplir à la grâce, acceptée dans la foi seule, une fonction salvifique du début à la fin.

⁽¹⁰³⁾ Of course, Paul did not think that by becoming a Christian he had departed from his ancestral religion as represented in the OT and in the remnant of grace (see esp. Rom 11). Nor did he think it wrong to practice Judaism apart from an attempt to establish one's standing before God (see esp. 1 Cor 9,20; Rom 14; also the portrait of Paul in Acts 13-28, which some would discount, however, as due to a catholicizing tendency). But the great autobiographical reversal Paul details in Gal 1,13-14; Phil 3,4-9 and his battle against the Judaizers show it is appropriate to speak of his getting out of Judaism. The possibility that he reacted against hellenistic or Diaspora Judaism rather than against Palestinian Judaism has not entered the present discussion because Sanders dismisses it, probably rightly (*PPJ*, 1-12; see further IDEM, "The Covenant as a Soteriological Category and the Nature of Salvation in Palestinian and Hellenistic Judaism", *Jews, Greeks and Christians: Religious Cultures in Late Antiquity* [Essays in Honor of W. D. Davies; ed. R. HAMMERTON-KELLY and R. SCROGGS; SJLA 21; Leiden 1976] 11-44, that covenantal nomism characterized hellenistic as well as Palestinian Judaism anyway). Nor have Jesus' quarrels with his opponents on legal questions – though his opinions could only support Paul's estimate – come under consideration. Form and redaction critical issues would attenuate any argument so derived. Finally, for present purposes it has not seemed necessary to discuss the question whether or not justification by faith is the center of Paul's theology (see R. Y. K. FUNG, "The Status of Justification by Faith in Paul's Thought: A Brief Survey of a Modern Debate", *Themelios* 6 [3, 1981] 4-11).

My thanks to Sanders for graciously and voluntarily sending me a manuscript of *PLJP* long before its publication.

Dieu donne son Nom à Jésus

Analyse rhétorique de Lc 1,26-56 et de 1 Sam 2,1-10

Tous les auteurs s'accordent à reconnaître que les deux premiers chapitres de Luc mettent en parallèle les enfances de Jean et de Jésus. En revanche ils sont souvent en désaccord sur la manière dont est organisé littérairement ce parallèle⁽¹⁾. Tous les plans proposés se basent sur un découpage du texte en récits⁽²⁾. Il ne saurait être question de nier l'existence de récits dans les évangiles en général et dans les deux premiers chapitres de Luc en particulier. Cependant, on peut se demander si le récit est toujours l'unité littéraire la plus pertinente, ou si elle est la seule qui le soit. Ou encore, pour poser le problème autrement, si d'une part il peut exister des unités qui regroupent dans un seul ensemble cohérent plusieurs récits et si d'autre part à l'intérieur de ces ensembles les limites entre les différents morceaux qui les composent coïncident obligatoirement avec celles des récits.

La présente étude se propose de montrer que la Visitation et le Magnificat ne forment pas une «suite»⁽³⁾, un «élargissement»⁽⁴⁾ ou

(1) Voir le résumé des différentes positions dans R. E. BROWN, *The Birth of the Messiah: A Commentary of the Infancy Narrative in Matthew and Luke* (New York 1977) 248-249; voir aussi A. GEORGE, «Le parallèle entre Jean-Baptiste et Jésus en Lc 1-2», *Mélanges Bibliques en hommage au R. P. Bédaride Rigaux* (Gembloux 1970) 147-148; C. H. TALBERT, *Literary Patterns, Theological Themes and the Genre of Luke-Acts* (SBLMS 20; Missoula 1974) 44-45.

(2) Ce que fait aussi l'analyse sémiotique; voir R. LAURENTIN, *Les évangiles de l'enfance du Christ* (Paris 1982) 178-265 (7 récits); A. GUEURET, *L'engendrement d'un récit, l'évangile de l'enfance du Christ* (LD 113; Paris 1983) (3 séquences et 7 sous-séquences).

(3) E. BURROWS, *The Gospel of the Infancy* (Londres 1940); P. GAECHTER, *Maria im Erdenleben. Neutestamentliche Marienstudien* (Innsbruck 1964).

(4) S. LYONNET, *Le récit de l'annonciation et la maternité divine de la Sainte Vierge* (Rome 1954) 6-8.

un «épisode complémentaire»⁽⁵⁾ du couple des annonces à Zacharie et Marie, mais qu'ils constituent avec 1,26-38 un ensemble littéraire unifié. C'est, à notre avis, cet ensemble tout entier qui est parallèle à l'Annonciation à Zacharie et pas seulement le récit de l'Annonciation à Marie. Si 1,26-56 forme bien une unité littéraire fermement structurée, alors pourront se lire des effets de sens qui n'apparaissent pas avec la même force quand les morceaux sont considérés comme des unités juxtaposées. Par ailleurs, déjà au niveau des parties de cet ensemble, la composition rhétorique de chaque morceau ne devrait pas être sans répercussion sur leur interprétation. L'approche adoptée ici est celle de la méthode rhétorique⁽⁶⁾.

1. L'Annonciation (1,26-38)

1.1 *Problème de découpage*

Du point de vue du récit, l'épisode est clairement délimité: Zacharie et Elisabeth ont quitté la scène et c'est maintenant un nouveau personnage, dans un autre lieu, à un autre moment, dont il va être question. La fin de l'épisode est marquée par le départ de l'ange qui au début du récit avait été envoyé à Marie.

Ce récit n'a jamais été véritablement analysé du point de vue rhétorique. Seul, à notre connaissance, Lucien Legrand y a entr'aperçu une certaine symétrie:

1. Envoi du messager	26	A
2. La destinataire	27	B
3. Salutation	28	C
4. Première réaction	29	D
5 Première partie du message		E
tu as trouvé grâce	30	Ea
voici tu enfanteras	31	Eb
première description	32-33	Ec
6. Seconde réaction	34	D'

⁽⁵⁾ R. LAURENTIN, *Structure et théologie de Luc I-II* (Paris 1957) 33; repris par L. LEGRAND, *L'annonce à Marie* (LD 106; Paris 1981) 288-291 et J. FITZMYER, *The Gospel according to Luke (I-IX)* (AB 27; New York 1980) 313-314.

⁽⁶⁾ Voir R. MEYNET, *Quelle est donc cette Parole?* (LD 99; Paris 1979) et *Initiation à la rhétorique biblique* (Paris 1982).

7. seconde partie du message		E'
l'Esprit viendra sur toi	35a	E'a'
seconde description	35b	E'c'
voici elle a engendré	36	E'b'
rien n'est impossible	37	F
8. Réponse de Marie	38a	B'
9. Départ de l'Ange	38b	A'

Il commente: «La symétrie est évidente. Il faut cependant résister à la tentation de faire des fausses fenêtres pour cette symétrie... On ne peut pas parler de construction concentrique au sens propre»⁽⁷⁾. Le fait que Legrand n'a pas pu saisir la symétrie réelle du texte est dû à deux raisons: d'une part son analyse est trop globale, d'autre part et surtout, son découpage n'est pas exact: de quelque manière qu'on envisage le texte, les deux premiers versets du récit ne peuvent pas entrer dans la figure extrêmement régulière de la suite (28-38). Les versets 26-27 présentent, il est vrai, les personnages et les lieux de la scène qui va suivre, mais le récit de l'action n'a pas encore commencé à proprement parler. Certes, il est possible de voir dans 26-27 l'élément symétrique de la dernière phrase, «et l'ange la quitta»; il est cependant tout aussi légitime, pour le moins, de considérer que le véritable segment symétrique de la dernière phrase se trouve au début du verset 27:

καὶ εἰσελθὼν	[ὁ ἄγγελος]	πρὸς αὐτήν	28
καὶ ἀπῆλθεν	ἀπ' αὐτῆς	ὁ ἄγγελος	38

où tous les éléments se retrouvent et point d'autres: le sujet («l'ange», lexicalisé même au début de 28 selon un grand nombre de témoins), deux verbes plus directement opposés entre eux que ne le sont «fut envoyé» (26) et «quitta» puisqu'ils sont de même racine. L'opposition des préfixes verbaux se retrouve dans celle des prépositions *pros* et *apo*. Le pronom objet indirect est le même et a le même référent, «Marie»; les deux phrases sont également introduites par *kai*.

Le découpage ainsi envisagé ne se révélera rhétoriquement vala-

⁽⁷⁾ LEGRAND, *L'annonce*, 50.

ble que si chacune des deux parties ainsi distinguées peut manifester une composition régulière.

1.2 Deuxième partie (1,28-38)

1.2.1 Composition du texte (voir la mise en page de tout le texte, en traduction française, Planche 1, p. 66)

La deuxième partie (28-38) est effectivement organisée, comme tant de textes bibliques, de façon concentrique. Aux extrémités, deux passages de composition analogue :

+ 28	καὶ εἰσελθὼν πρὸς αὐτήν	εἶπεν·
.	«Χαῖρε, κεχαριτωμένη	ὁ ΚΥΡΙΟΣ μετὰ σοῦ». 29
.	ἡ δὲ ἐπὶ τῷ λόγῳ διετα- ράχθη	καὶ διελογίζετο ποταπὸς εἴη ὁ ἀσπασμὸς οὗτος
+ 30	καὶ εἶπεν ὁ ἄγγελος	αὐτῇ
+ 38	Εἶπεν δὲ	Μαριάμ·
.	«ἰδοὺ ἡ δούλη ΚΥΡΙΟΥ.	
.	γένοιτό μοι κατὰ τὸ ῥῆμά σου	
+	καὶ ἀπῆλθεν ἀπ' αὐτῆς	ὁ ἄγγελος

Encadré par deux phrases de récit (38a et d), le dernier passage donne la réponse de Marie à l'annonce de l'ange (38bc). Le premier passage est lui-aussi encadré par deux courtes phrases de récit (28a et 30a) avec le même verbe «dit». Entre deux, la salutation de l'ange (28b) et la réaction de Marie à cette salutation (29). Les deux phrases extrêmes s'opposent mot à mot (cf. *supra*).

Les limites de la partie centrale sont marquées par une inclusion :

MH	φοβοῦ, Μαριάμ,	εὗρες γὰρ χάριν	παρὰ τῷ θεῷ·
OYK	ἀδυνατήσει	παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ	πᾶν ῥῆμα·

en effet 30b et 37 comportent le même segment «chez Dieu»; les deux verbes qui s'opposent par le temps sont affectés cependant de la même négation.

Ce sont ensuite deux passages de construction concentrique:

. 31	καὶ ἰδοὺ συλλήμῃ ἐν γαστρὶ	
.	καὶ τέξῃ	υἱὸν
.	καὶ καλέσεις τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ	Ἰησοῦν
	- 32 οὗτος ἔσται ΜΕΓΑΣ καὶ υἱὸς ὑψίστου κληθήσεται	
.	καὶ δώσει αὐτῷ κύριος ὁ θεὸς τὸν θρόνον	Δαυὶδ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ
. 33	καὶ βασιλεύσει ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον Ἰακώβ	εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας
.	καὶ τῆς βασιλείας αὐτοῦ	οὐκ ἔσται τέλος

.	πνεῦμα ἅγιον ἐπελεύσεται ἐπὶ σέ	
.	καὶ δύναμις ὑψίστου ἐπισκιάσει σοι	
	- διὸ καὶ τὸ γεννώμενον ἍΓΙΟΝ κληθήσεται υἱὸς θεοῦ	
. 36	καὶ ἰδοὺ Ἑλισάβετ ἡ συγγεσίς σου καὶ αὐτὴ συνέλληφεν	υἱὸν ἐν γήρει αὐτῆς
.	καὶ οὗτος μὴν ἔστιν αὐτῇ τῇ καλουμένῃ	στεῖρα

Les deux segments centraux (32a et 35d)⁽⁸⁾ sont parallèles et synonymes. Alors que dans le premier passage le segment central est encadré par deux parties de rythme ternaire, dans le deuxième elle l'est par deux parties de rythme binaire. Le verset 31 énumère les trois étapes de la conception, de la naissance et de la nomination (qui a lieu lors de la circoncision; cf. 2,21); les versets 32b-33 insistent par trois fois sur la même idée de royauté («trône», «régnera», «régne»), avec une progression du passé («David son père») à un avenir illimité («pour les siècles» et «pas de fin»). Les deux éléments du binaire de 35bc sont synonymes et reprennent deux mots qui apparaissent dans les deux segments centraux («saint» comme en 35d et «Très-Haut» comme en 32a); les deux éléments du binaire de 36 sont eux aussi synonymes, le deuxième précisant la date de la conception, tous deux se terminant par deux segments «dans sa vieillesse» et «la Stérile», qui indiquent tous deux l'impossibilité où était Élisabeth d'avoir un enfant. D'une partie à l'autre, noter la reprise, inclusive, de «concevras» (31a) et «a conçu» (36a) et de «un fils» (31b et 36a): les deux sous-parties 31 et 36 (qui par ailleurs commencent avec le même «voici que») se répondent donc en chiasme. Les deux autres sous-parties (32b-33 et 35bc) disent la double origine de Jésus, fils de David («David son père» en 32b) et né par la «puissance du Très-Haut» (35c).

⁽⁸⁾ Pour la traduction de 35d, voir la discussion dans LEGRAND, *L'annonce*, 288-291.

Enfin, au centre de l'ensemble, la question⁽⁹⁾ de Marie (34b), encadrée par deux phrases de récit opposées (34a et 35a); les deux propositions opposent ce qui est annoncé («cela») et la situation présente de Marie qui est «sans homme»⁽¹⁰⁾.

34 εἶπεν δὲ Μαριάμ πρὸς τοῦ ἀγγελον·
 «Πῶς ἔσται τοῦτο, ἐπεὶ ἄνδρα οὐ γινώσκω;»
 35 καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ ἀγγελος; εἶπεν αὐτῇ·

La construction coïncide presque avec l'alternance des paroles et des phrases de récit: les deux discours de l'ange encadrent la question de Marie et la réponse finale de Marie est symétrique de la salutation du début. Le verset 29, qui est une phrase de récit, comprend cependant une question indirecte: «quelle était cette salutation».

1.2.2 Indications pour l'interprétation

La mise en valeur d'une construction n'a pas seulement une valeur esthétique. L'organisation du texte ne peut rester sans incidence sur son interprétation. Non pas qu'elle la détermine *ipso facto*, mais parce qu'elle permet sans doute de mieux situer les axes majeurs du texte par rapport auxquels se situent les autres éléments.

Ici les segments presque identiques de 32a et 35d (à la seule variante synonymique près de «Très-Haut» et «Dieu») obligent à reconnaître dans les deux adjectifs qui précèdent, «grand» et «saint», un couple complémentaire. Par ailleurs la position symétriquement semblable de ces deux phrases, aux centres des deux discours de l'ange, permet d'en constater l'importance: là est définie l'identité de Jésus.

Le lien et le passage qu'assure la question centrale de Marie entre ces deux phrases permet que soit mise en évidence l'origine

⁽⁹⁾ Il est assez fréquent qu'une question occupe le centre d'une construction concentrique: voir *Quelle est donc cette Parole?*, Planches A3, A7, B2 et aussi B6 et D1.

⁽¹⁰⁾ P. JOÛON avait bien exprimé la structure globale du passage: «la disposition du récit, coupé par la pause de l'ange et la question de la vierge, invite à voir dans la description de l'enfant qui va être conçu, non pas un tableau unique, mais comme les deux volets d'un diptyque», «L'annonciation (Lc 1,26-38)», *NRT* 71 (1939) 793-794.

toute particulière de Jésus: «Fils du Très-Haut / de Dieu» ne sont pas seulement ici des titres royaux, comme pourrait le faire penser la triple annonce de 32b-33; pour marquer la différence et la spécificité unique de l'origine de Jésus, Luc nie le contraire: non seulement Jésus sera appelé Fils de Dieu, mais encore il ne sera pas le fils d'un homme («je ne connais pas d'homme»), ce qui sera explicité juste après (35bc).

Ces quelques remarques voulaient seulement montrer comment l'analyse rhétorique, qui dégage les principales arêtes du texte, pouvait permettre de se diriger plus directement et plus sûrement vers ce qui fait le centre du message.

1.3 Première partie (1,26-27)

1.3.1 Composition du texte

L'introduction du récit de l'Annonciation est d'une construction particulièrement élaborée:

26 ἐν δὲ τῇ μηνὶ τῇ ἑκτῇ	ἀπεστάλη ὁ ἄγγελος	ΓΑΒΡΙΗΛ
	ἀπὸ τοῦ	ΘΕΟΥ
εἰς πόλιν τῆς Γαλιλαίας	ἧ ὄνομα	ΝΑΖΑΡΗΘ
27 -----		
πρὸς παρθένον ἐμνηστευμένην ἀνδρὶ	ὃ ὄνομα	ΙΩΣΗΦ
	ἐξ οἴκου	ΔΑΥΙΔ
καὶ τὸ ὄνομα	τῆς παρθένου	ΜΑΡΙΑΜ

Chacun des six segments s'achève sur un nom propre. Au début et à la fin, ceux des protagonistes du récit qui va suivre: «Gabriel» l'envoyé et «Marie» à qui il est envoyé. Au centre, «Nazareth» et «Joseph», chacun précédé du même «du nom de»; au début de ces segments, deux prépositions synonymes. Entre deux, introduits par des prépositions qui indiquent toutes deux une origine, deux courts segments (26b et 27b).

1.3.2 Pour l'interprétation

Les deux mentions d'origine, en position symétrique, au centre des deux versants de la phrase, sembleraient suggérer discrètement la double origine de Jésus, à la fois fils de Dieu et fils de David. Ce

que confirme la suite du texte dans le balancement, inversé cette fois-ci, entre «David son père» (32b) et fils du «Très-Haut» dont la puissance couvre Marie (35c).

2. La Visitation (1,39-45)

2.1 *Composition du texte* (traduction, Planche 2, p. 67)

Sans être aussi manifeste que celle de 28-38, la composition du passage est néanmoins assez clairement concentrique. Deux parties (39-42a et 43-45), l'une de récit, l'autre de discours, encadrent la double bénédiction centrale (42bc). Au centre du deuxième versant (44) est repris sous forme de dialogue ce qui avait été dit, sous forme de récit, au centre du premier versant (41ab)⁽¹¹⁾.

41 καὶ ἐγένετο ὥς ἤκουσεν τὸν ἀσπασμὸν τῆς Μαρίας ἡ Ἐλισάβετ,
ἐσκήρτησεν [ἐν ἀγαλλιασει] τὸ βρέφος ἐν τῇ κοιλίᾳ αὐτῆς.

44 ἰδοὺ γὰρ ὥς ἐγένετο
 ἡ φωνὴ τοῦ ἀσπασμοῦ σου εἰς τὰ ὦτά μου,
ἐσκήρτησεν ἐν ἀγαλλιάσει τὸ βρέφος ἐν τῇ κοιλίᾳ μου.

Les éléments extrêmes des binaires qui encadrent le centre (41c-42a et 43):

: καὶ ἐπλήσθη ΠΝΕΥΜΑΤΟΣ ΑΓΙΟΥ ἡ Ἐλισάβετ
. 42 καὶ ἀνεφώνησεν κραυγῇ μεγάλῃ

. καὶ πόθεν μοι τοῦτο
: ἵνα ἔλθῃ ἡ μήτηρ ΤΟΥ ΚΥΠΙΟΥ ΜΟΥ πρὸς ἐμέ;

comprennent deux noms divins, «l'Esprit Saint» et «mon Seigneur»; ils commencent tous deux avec un verbe et surtout s'achèvent, le premier avec «Élisabeth», l'autre avec le pronom «moi» dont le référent est Élisabeth. Les binaires extrêmes (39-40 et 45) n'ont aucun mot en commun, mais ils ont le même sujet; à part le premier membre du binaire central (42b), ce sont les seules principales dont le sujet soit Marie.

⁽¹¹⁾ Plusieurs bons témoins renforcent le parallélisme en ajoutant «de jubilation» en 41b.

2.2 Pour l'interprétation

Le parallèle établi par Burrows et Laurentin⁽¹²⁾ entre ce récit et celui de la montée de l'Arche d'alliance vers Jérusalem (2 Sam 6), avec en particulier la reprise de la même exclamation par David et par Élisabeth

«Comment (se peut-il que) l' Arche du Seigneur
vienne à moi!» (2 Sam 6,9)
«D'où me (vient) que la mère de mon Seigneur
vienne à moi!» (Lc 1,43)

semble «vraiment trop subtile» à Fitzmyer⁽¹³⁾.

Par contre, ce dernier admet le parallèle de la double bénédiction centrale (42bc) avec celle de Jdt 13,18-19 (et Gn 14,19-20). J. Guillet⁽¹⁴⁾ voit dans ces doubles bénédictions le type de la bénédiction dans l'Ancien Testament: après avoir étudié les formules de bénédiction de l'homme (pp. 187-197) et celles de la bénédiction de Dieu (pp. 197-200), il conclut: «Le schéma type de la bénédiction n'est pas: «Béni N.!» d'une part, et «Béni Dieu!» de l'autre, mais «Béni N. et béni Dieu!» Plus d'un exemple l'atteste»⁽¹⁵⁾. Puis il explique: «Dans ce schéma complet apparaît la nature exacte de la bénédiction. Elle est une explosion ravie à la vue d'un être en qui Dieu a fait éclater sa puissance. Mais cette explosion ne s'arrête pas à l'être privilégié: elle remonte à sa source, à Dieu. Né d'une révélation de Dieu, l'élan émerveillé ne se contente pas de proclamer «Béni es-tu de Yahvé ton Dieu!» Il lui faut crier toute la vérité: «Béni est Yahvé ton Dieu!». Il est lui le *baruk* par excellence, le Béni; il possède en plénitude toute bénédiction» (p. 202).

Il est donc tentant de voir, avec Laurentin, dans cette double bénédiction une allusion discrète à la divinité du Christ puisque, structurellement parlant, si c'est bien ce schéma qui se trouve réalisé, Jésus tient ici la place de Dieu.

⁽¹²⁾ BURROWS, *The Gospel of the Infancy*, 47.

⁽¹³⁾ FITZMYER, *Luke*, 365.

⁽¹⁴⁾ J. GUILLET, «Le langage spontané de la bénédiction dans l'Ancien Testament», *RSR* 57 (1969) 163-204.

⁽¹⁵⁾ *Ibid.*, p. 201; les exemples fournis, outre Gn 14,19-20 et Jdt 13,17s, 1 Sam 25,32s et même 1R 10,8-9.

On n'a pas manqué d'objecter que cette lecture est impossible pour une simple raison de vocabulaire: *eulogètos* est de fait réservé à Dieu dans le Nouveau Testament, y compris dans Luc, et *eulogèmenos* n'y est jamais appliqué à Dieu mais toujours aux hommes, y compris Jésus. Laurentin⁽¹⁶⁾ réfute justement ces objections en faisant remarquer l'emploi ambivalent que fait la LXX de ces deux mots (qui traduisent le même *baruk*) utilisés l'un et l'autre pour l'homme et pour Dieu⁽¹⁷⁾. Pour Jdt 13,18, c'est le Seigneur qui est *eulogèmenos* et Judith *eulogètè*!

Si c'était le seul endroit dans tout le passage 26-56 où Jésus soit présenté comme l'homologue de Dieu, il pourrait y avoir des doutes légitimes sur cette lecture. Comme le dit Laurentin, «Il y a là un indice ténu qui vaut à la mesure de sa convergence avec les autres»⁽¹⁸⁾. Il faudra y revenir en fin de parcours. Quoi qu'il en soit, la place centrale de ce binaire doit attirer l'attention de l'interprète.

3. Le chant de Marie (46-55)

3.1 *La composition du texte* (traduction, Planche 3, p. 68)

Contrairement aux deux passages précédents, le Magnificat a donné lieu à bien des analyses littéraires de toutes sortes.

Sans vouloir remonter jusqu'à Gunkel lui-même et suivre l'évolution de l'étude de la forme du Magnificat chez ses successeurs⁽¹⁹⁾, qu'il suffise de mentionner ici que, jusque dans les plus récents commentaires, sa position est encore suivie fidèlement. Ainsi Fitzmyer⁽²⁰⁾ reconnaît-il dans le Magnificat la reprise de la forme des psaumes de Louange (Ps 33,47,48,113,135 et surtout 136) qui fait succéder à une invitation à la louange (Lc 1,46-47) ou introduction, le corps de l'hymne (introduit par *hoti*, l'équivalent du *ki* hébreu); cette longue deuxième partie (dont on exclut 48 considéré comme

⁽¹⁶⁾ LAURENTIN, *Structure et théologie*, 82 (note 1).

⁽¹⁷⁾ Exemples de *eulogètos* pour l'homme: Dt 7,14; Rt 2,20; 1 Sam 15,13; 25,33; exemples de *eulogèmenos* pour Dieu: 1 Chr 16,36; 2 Chr 9,8; Jb 1,21; Dan 3,53ss.

⁽¹⁸⁾ LAURENTIN, *Structure et théologie*, 82.

⁽¹⁹⁾ Ce qu'a fait Alberto VALENTINI dans sa thèse soutenue le 25.02.83, *Il Magnificat: ricerca contemporanea — struttura — esegi* (Rome 1982) (ronéoté), vol 1, pp. 8-57.

⁽²⁰⁾ Luke, 359s.

une insertion proprement chrétienne destinée à rattacher le poème à la situation particulière de Marie) se subdivise alors soit en trois soit mieux en deux strophes, la première (49-50) qui décrit les attributs de Dieu, la seconde (51-53) ses grandes œuvres. Les versets 54-55 forment une conclusion qui reprend certains éléments du corps.

De nouvelles études, de type plus ou moins rhétorique, se sont détachées du modèle de Gunkel pour étudier le texte en lui-même, sans référence à la forme à laquelle il appartiendrait et surtout en le prenant dans son intégrité actuelle. Sans entrer dans le détail de toute leur argumentation, il est cependant utile de présenter rapidement leurs résultats. Pour C. R. Tannehil⁽²¹⁾, le chant est organisé en deux strophes (46b-50 et 51-55); de ce schéma fondamental se détachent deux passages (49b-50 et 54b-55) aux caractéristiques propres; le fait qu'ils soient placés à la fin de chacune des deux strophes et qu'ils soient parallèles entre eux permet d'y reconnaître la conclusion de ces strophes⁽²²⁾. Deux ans plus tard, L. Monloubou⁽²³⁾ découpe le texte en trois parties. Comme chez Tannehil, sa première partie va jusqu'à la fin de 50. Il y découvre une composition parallèle: après une introduction (46b-47), la suite énonce deux motifs de la louange (48a et 49a introduits par *hoti*), suivis tous deux par une «explicative»: 48b (introduit par *idou gar*) qui énonce la conséquence qui va découler du geste de Dieu, et les deux propositions de 49b et 50 (introduites par *kai*) qui disent quelque chose du mystère divin que le geste de Dieu a révélé. La deuxième partie (51-54) est une énumération de sept affirmations qui élargissent la réflexion en rapprochant le geste que Dieu vient d'accomplir de ceux qu'il a coutume de réaliser. J. Irigouin⁽²⁴⁾, par une analyse purement rythmique, arrive à un découpage global qui confirme la coupure entre 50 et 51.

L'analyse de J. Dupont⁽²⁵⁾ concilie l'approche de l'étude des formes (bipartition entre une introduction, 46-47, et une liste des rai-

(21) R. C. TANNEHIL, "The Magnificat as Poem", *JBL* 93 (1974) 263-275.

(22) C'était déjà le point de vue de Gunkel qui y voyait des ajouts, normaux dans des productions tardives, au noyau du corps de l'hymne (49a et 51-54).

(23) L. MONLOUBOU, *La prière selon Saint Luc, recherche d'une structure* (LD 89; Paris 1976).

(24) J. IRIGOIN, «La composition rythmique du Magnificat», *Mélanges Emile de Strycker* (Anvers 1973) 618-628.

(25) J. DUPONT, «Le Magnificat comme discours sur Dieu», *NRT* 112 (1980) 321-343.

sons de la louange) et celle de Tannehil (allongement final des strophes en 49b-50 et 54-55). Il en arrive à distinguer finalement quatre parties (46-47, 48-50, 51-53 et 54-55), mais il relativise ce découpage en montrant non seulement les liens des parties entre elles, mais encore qu'elles se chevauchent (p. 329).

Toute autre est l'étude de D. Mínguez⁽²⁶⁾. Comme elle concorde largement avec celle qui va suivre⁽²⁷⁾, elle ne sera pas résumée ici. Mais nous y renverrons pour marquer les points sur lesquels nous divergeons et aussi les constatations que nous lui devons⁽²⁸⁾.

Le point de divergence majeur avec les études précédentes est non pas le fait de la symétrie entre 49b-50 et 54b-55 (quoiqu'il ne faille pas en réalité inclure 49b dans cete symétrie), mais le statut qu'il faut lui reconnaître dans le texte. En effet, si ces deux passages peuvent être considérés comme conclusion-élargissement des parties qui les précèdent⁽²⁹⁾, ils peuvent tout aussi bien, en principe, être tenus pour les termes extrêmes d'une construction concentrique.

En faveur de la première thèse, on fait valoir⁽³⁰⁾ que 49b et 50 sont liés syntaxiquement à ce qui précède par les «conjonctions» *kai* par lesquelles ils commencent. On a même voulu, pour souligner cette fonction de coordination de *kai*, lui attribuer une valeur de pronom relatif⁽³¹⁾. Cet argument ne nous semble pas dirimant, car il

(26) D. MÍNGUEZ, «Poética generativa del Magnificat», *Bibl* 61 (1980) 57-77.

(27) Nous avons donné en 1979, dans *Quelle est donc cette Parole?*, 173-5, une première analyse du Magnificat dont les résultats globaux se retrouvent ici. Cependant ce premier essai n'avait été mené que sur un seul critère, celui des récurrences lexicales. La critique de J. DUPONT, «Le Magnificat», est tout à fait justifiée; voir aussi ses réserves sur notre étude de Lc 24 dans «Les disciples d'Emmaüs», dans *La Pâque du Christ, mystère du salut, Mélanges Durrwell* (LD 112; Paris 1982) 167-192.

(28) Il faut ajouter la position de VALENTINI, *Il Magnificat*, qui est une synthèse mais qui suit cependant d'assez près Tannehil. Voir aussi I. GOMÁ CIVIT, *El Magnificat. Cántico de la salvación* (Madrid 1982) et *Biblia y Fe* 27 entièrement consacré au Magnificat.

(29) Ce que BOYS appelait «final terms», *A Key to the Book of the Psalms* (Londres 1825) 15-16, 50-51. Pour un cas particulièrement intéressant, voir notre «Deux paraboles parallèles. Analyse rhétorique de Lc 15,1-32», *Annales de Philosophie* 2 (Université Saint-Joseph; Beyrouth 1981) 89-105.

(30) Par exemple, L. RAMAROSON, «Ad structuram cantici Magnificat», *VD* 46 (1968) 31, note 1; MONLOUBOU, *La prière*, 222; VALENTINI, *Il Magnificat*, 214.

(31) Voir LAGRANGE, *Evangile selon St Luc* (Paris 1921) 47, qui rapporte

arrive souvent dans Luc que des parties très bien identifiées par leur cohésion interne commencent avec un *kai*: pour ne pas sortir de Lc 1,26-56, tel est le cas au début de la partie 28-38⁽³²⁾. On pourra se demander par ailleurs s'il serait bien légitime de coordonner 49b et 50 qui sont des phrases nominales avec 49a qui est une phrase verbale au passé. Du point de vue du sens, il semble difficile de mettre sur le même plan deux énonciations d'ordre général qui décrivent des attributs divins avec le récit d'une action spécifique. Cela n'empêcherait pas cependant de considérer 49b-50 comme une conclusion, d'ordre général, pour l'ensemble de la première partie. Nous voyons à cette position deux difficultés. La première est d'ordre purement interne: si 49b n'existait pas, il n'y aurait pas de problème car 50 et 54b-55 sont deux morceaux tout à fait symétriques qui pourraient conclure symétriquement 46-49a et 51-54a. Que faire alors de 49b qui reste hors système? Parler de souplesse et d'élégance⁽³³⁾ ne serait qu'une échappatoire. La deuxième raison est externe: Lund a remarqué depuis longtemps que les noms divins avaient tendance à occuper dans les Psaumes des positions privilégiées, le centre en particulier⁽³⁴⁾. Ce serait ici le cas.

Enfin, une raison supplémentaire, en fait le critère décisif, sera la cohérence de chacune des parties délimitées par l'option qui consiste à considérer 49b comme le centre du chant. S'il se vérifie que 50-55 d'une part et 46b-49 de l'autre sont composés de façon très régulière, ce ne sera pas un argument de peu de poids. Une analyse a en effet d'autant plus de chance d'être juste qu'elle rend compte de façon cohérente de l'ensemble des faits.

Vérifions donc d'abord si 50-55 forme une sous-unité cohérente. Et d'abord il faut assurer, de façon précise, la symétrie de 50 et 54b-55. Chacun des deux morceaux comprend quatre éléments:

les opinions de Maldonnat, Blass, mais ajoute qu'il n'y a pas de raison de changer le texte. Nestlé-Aland coupe par un point entre 49a et 49b. A. PLUMMER isole 49b: *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to Luke* (Edimbourg 1922; rééd. 1953) 32.

⁽³²⁾ Toujours dans Luc, 18,31-19,36 forme un ensemble fortement structuré qui comprend sept péripécies; si la première commence avec *de* ainsi que trois autres (18,35; 19,11.37), trois d'entre elles qui sont des récits bien individualisés commencent avec un *kai* (19,1.29.41).

⁽³³⁾ Comme LEGRAND pour l'Annonciation, *L'Annonce*, 50.

⁽³⁴⁾ N. W. LUND, *Chiasmus in the New Testament* (Chapel Hill 1942) 41 (voir aussi ses exemples, pp. 95ss).

+ 50 καὶ τὸ ΕΛΕΟΣ αὐτοῦ
 = εἰς γενεὰς
 = καὶ γενεὰς
 : τοῖς φοβουμένοις αὐτόν.

+ μνησθῆναι ΕΛΕΟΥΣ
 : 55 καθὼς ἐλάλησεν πρὸς τοὺς πατέρας ἡμῶν
 : τῷ Ἀβραὰμ καὶ τῷ σπέρματι αὐτοῦ
 = εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.

«Miséricorde» se trouve dans les premiers segments⁽³⁵⁾. Par contre il y a interversion des autres éléments symétriques: le double «pour des générations et des générations» au centre du premier morceau est repris, sous forme unique, à la fin (ce qui en fait une fin de doxologie normale, ce que ne serait pas 50) introduit par la même préposition *eis*. En revanche le dernier segment de 50 est repris dans le binaire du centre du dernier morceau. Mínguez remarque avec raison que *tois phouboumenoís* et *tōi Abraham kai tōi spermati* sont les seuls datifs d'attribution de tout le chant⁽³⁶⁾.

Ce sont ensuite deux stiques qui se correspondent:

51	ἘΠΟΙΗΣΕΝ	χράτος	ἐν βραχίονι	αὐτοῦ
54	ἈΝΤΕΛΑΒΕΤΟ	Ἰσραὴλ	παιδὸς	αὐτοῦ

Si on peut remarquer la correspondance «bras» – «cœurs» entre 51a et 51b, il faut bien admettre que ces deux stiques ne présentent pas une symétrie aussi forte que celle qui existe par exemple entre 51b et 52a. En revanche 51a et 54a sont complémentaires: le premier décrit l'action de Dieu en elle-même, la deuxième du point de vue de son bénéficiaire; les deux stiques commencent également avec une asyndète et s'achèvent par le même pronom qui ne se retrouvera pas avec le même référent entre deux. On a voulu voir une construction chiasmatique dans 52-53⁽³⁷⁾:

⁽³⁵⁾ Jouant ainsi le rôle de «leading terms» selon la terminologie de Boys, *A Key*.

⁽³⁶⁾ «Poética», 59-60.

⁽³⁷⁾ Tannehil et plusieurs après lui jusqu'à Valentini, Mínguez y compris.

α	καθεῖλεν	δυνάστας	ἀπὸ θρόνων
β	καὶ ὕψωσεν	ταπεινούς.	
β'	πεινῶντας	ἐνέπλησεν	ἀγαθῶν
α'	καὶ πλουτοῦντας	ἐξάπέστειλεν	ενούς.

avec «les puissants» et «les riches» «renversés» et «renvoyés» aux extrémités et «les abaissés» et «les affamés», «élevés» et «remplis» au centre. Même si l'on fait remarquer les croisement des verbes et des substantifs, cette figure n'explique pas la brièveté exceptionnelle du deuxième stique. Il semble plus cohérent d'élargir le morceau à 51b:

διεσκόρπισεν		
. ὑπερηφάνους	διανοίᾳ	καρδίας αὐτῶν 52
καθεῖλεν		
. δυνάστας		ἀπὸ θρόνων
<div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; display: inline-block;"> καὶ ὕψωσεν ταπεινούς 53 </div>		
. πεινῶντας		
	ἐνέπλησεν	ἀγαθῶν
	καὶ	
. πλουτοῦντας		
	ἐξάπέστειλεν	κενούς.

Le stique «et il a élevé les abaissés» trouve alors, tout naturellement, sa place au centre de cette liste de cinq stiques. Les quatre autres sont plus longs que lui d'une expansion («de leurs cœurs», «de (leurs) trônes», «de biens», «vides»). La disposition des verbes et des substantifs s'organise alors régulièrement de chaque côté du centre. Mais, dira-t-on 51b et 52a sont synonymes, alors que 53a et 53b sont antithétiques. Si cette dissymétrie ne se retrouvait jamais ailleurs, l'argument vaudrait, mais on verra qu'un phénomène analogue se retrouve dans la partie centrale du Cantique d'Anne⁽³⁸⁾. La

⁽³⁸⁾ De même que le premier versant de l'Annonciation fait revenir un double rythme ternaire et le deuxième un double rythme binaire seulement. Un déséquilibre complémentaire du même ordre se retrouve aussi par exemple dans la description du chandelier à sept branches (voir notre «Au cœur

position centrale de 52b trouvera une confirmation dans son caractère général, par opposition aux segments qui l'entourent, de même que dans sa reprise ailleurs chez Luc, en 14,11⁽³⁹⁾ et en 18,14, et d'abord dans la première partie du Magnificat, sous la forme de l'opposition «abaissement» – «grandeurs» (48a et 49a).

Cette dernière partie étant, croit-on, bien identifiée dans sa cohérence interne, comment considérer ce qui la précède? Une première possibilité:

- Μεγαλύνει	ή ψυχή	μου	τὸν KYPION	
καὶ				
- ἡγαλλίασεν	το πνεῦμά	μου ἐπὶ	τῷ ΘΕΩ	τῷ σωτηρί μου

: 48 ὅτι ἐπέβλεψεν ἐπὶ *ΤΗΝ ΤΑΠΕΙΝΩΣΙΝ* τῆς ΔΟΥΛΗΣ αὐτοῦ
 ἰδοὺ γὰρ ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν μακαριοῦσίν με *πᾶσαι αἱ γενεαί*
 : 49 ὍΤΙ ἐποίησέν μοι ΜΕΓΑΛΑ ὁ ΔΥΝΑΤΟΣ *καὶ ἄγιον τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ*

serait de mettre à part les deux premiers versets: à ce binaire succéderait un ternaire (48-48a) de construction chiasmatique: en effet 48a et 49a, qui sont tout à fait parallèles, encadrent 48b. Le stique 49b serait alors considéré comme une expansion du ternaire qui correspondrait à l'expansion «mon sauveur» par laquelle s'achève le premier binaire.

Une deuxième possibilité:

- Μεγαλύνει	ή ψυχή	μου	τὸν KYPION	
καὶ				
- ἡγαλλίασεν	το πνεῦμά	μου ἐπὶ	τῷ ΘΕΩ	τῷ σωτηρί μου

: 48 ὍΤΙ ἐπέβλεψεν ἐπὶ *ΤΗΝ ΤΑΠΕΙΝΩΣΙΝ* τῆς ΔΟΥΛΗΣ αὐτοῦ
 ἰδοὺ γὰρ ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν μακαριοῦσίν με *πᾶσαι αἱ γενεαί*
 : 49 ὍΤΙ ἐποίησέν μοι ΜΕΓΑΛΑ ὁ ΔΥΝΑΤΟΣ
 καὶ
 : ἄγιον τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ.

consisterait à découper le texte en deux phrases: deux propositions principales coordonnées par «et» (46-47) seraient suivies d'une cau-

du texte, Analyse rhétorique de l'aveugle de Jéricho selon Saint Luc», *NRT* 103 [1981] 693-710).

⁽³⁹⁾ En position centrale de 14,7-14 (voir *Initiation à la rhétorique biblique*, 25-26 et Planche 2).

sale introduite par «parce que» (48a); puis une proposition principale (48b) serait suivie de deux causales (49a et b) coordonnées par «et» et introduites par «parce que». La troisième possibilité reprendrait la première mais détacherait 49b pour en faire le centre de l'ensemble du texte. La quatrième serait une variante de la deuxième, détachant encore 49b au centre de l'ensemble.

Ces diverses possibilités ont en commun deux observations tout à fait justes: que 46-47 forme un binaire parallèle et synonymique est indiscutable et que 48a et 49a soient symétriques («abaissement» est opposé à «grandeurs» et «sa servante» correspond à «le puissant») ne l'est pas moins. Tout le problème est en réalité de déterminer la *fonction* rhétorique de ces deux segments: ou bien en effet ils sont les termes extrêmes d'un morceau chiasmatique (possibilité 1), ou bien ils sont les éléments finaux de deux passages parallèles (possibilité 4). La première possibilité est intéressante mais elle met sur le même plan comme expansions équivalentes deux segments très différents: une courte apposition («mon sauveur») et une phrase («et saint est son nom»). La deuxième possibilité est, elle aussi, tentante qui balance les éléments syntaxiques 2 + 1 et 1 + 2, mais le dernier binaire (49a et b) est tout à fait déséquilibré: le parallélisme rigoureux de 48a et 49a oblige à mettre 49b à part. Enfin, un argument capital oblige à exclure 49b de la première partie: cette proposition est en effet la seule où n'apparaisse pas un pronom de première personne (ou de son équivalent «sa servante» dont le référent est cependant Marie).

Reste une correspondance qui n'a pas encore été relevée et qui résout le problème en permettant d'aboutir à une première partie tout à fait équilibrée où chaque élément trouve sa place. En 48b, «à partir de maintenant» qui indique un futur correspond à «toutes les générations» qui ici marque aussi un futur; ainsi cette proposition unique peut être considérée comme un binaire, symétrique de celui de 46-47 (suivre sur la Planche 3)⁽⁴⁰⁾. Tout se met ainsi en place,

⁽⁴⁰⁾ Il serait probablement plus exact de le considérer construit en chiasme:

ἰδοὺ γὰρ	{	ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν	MAKAPIOYΣIN ME
		πᾶσαι αἱ γένεαί	

ce qui met en valeur au centre le verbe et son complément d'objet, symétrique de «grandit» et «jubilé».

comme naturellement: un parallèle est ainsi établi entre la louange de Dieu par Marie (46-47), au présent⁽⁴¹⁾, motivée par 48a, au passé, et la louange de Marie par toutes les générations (48b), au futur, motivée par 49a, de nouveau au passé. Marie loue Dieu pour avoir été relevée de son «abaissement», les générations loueront Marie pour les «grandeurs» que Dieu lui a faites. Ainsi enfin, dernier argument, «grandit» (46) et «grandeurs» (49a) forment une bonne inclusion.

Au centre de tout le chant, la phrase nominale «et saint (est) son nom» qui ne peut être rattachée ni au deuxième ni au premier versant du texte.

D'une partie à l'autre, l'opposition «élevé» – «abaissés» du centre du deuxième versant trouve son équivalent à la fin des deux passages parallèles du premier versant, «abaissement» – «grandeurs». Dans le premier versant, c'est Marie qui est l'objet des actions de Dieu («il a fait» de 49a); dans le deuxième, c'est «ceux qui le craignent» (50), «nos pères», «Abraham et sa descendance» (55), c'est à dire «Israël» (54) qui est l'objet des actions du Seigneur («il a fait» de 51); l'une est «sa servante» (48a), l'autre «son serviteur» (54a)⁽⁴²⁾. La miséricorde de Dieu en faveur d'Israël s'étend «pour des générations et des générations» (50), «pour les siècles» (55c) et en retour «toutes les générations» (48c) loueront l'action de Dieu en faveur de Marie. D'une partie à l'autre, l'action du «puissant» (49) s'oppose à celle des «puissants» (52).

3.2 De l'analyse formelle au sens

La construction du Magnificat, telle qu'elle vient d'être établie, est tout à fait conforme aux règles habituelles de la rhétorique biblique. Elle vérifie en particulier la loi n° 1 de Lund: «*Le centre marque toujours un tournant*. Le centre peut consister en un, deux, trois ou même quatre stiques»⁽⁴³⁾. Ici le centre est formé d'un seul stique;

⁽⁴¹⁾ *ègalliasen* est traduit par un présent car il peut être considéré comme un aoriste ingressif.

⁽⁴²⁾ «Servante» et «serviteur» traduisent deux synonymes, *doulè* et *paidos*.

⁽⁴³⁾ *Chiasmus*, 40; notre première traduction (*Quelle est donc cette Parole?* 124) était erronée.

on verra plus loin que le cantique d'Anne est centré sur un passage qui comprend quatre stiques. Que le centre d'un texte soit important avait été déjà perçu par John Forbes: «L'idée centrale, telle un cœur⁽⁴⁴⁾, peut être le centre animateur de l'ensemble, envoyant son énergie et sa chaleur vitale jusqu'aux extrémités»⁽⁴⁵⁾.

Le centre est souvent énigmatique, telle une clé qui peut fermer aussi bien qu'ouvrir. Comme toute énigme, le segment central d'un texte invite à la réflexion. Or il ne saurait y avoir de réflexion sans la mémoire, surtout dans le domaine biblique. La mémoire c'est l'intertexte, la référence à d'autres textes: *Scriptura interpres sui*. Le fait que tout le chant de Marie soit centré sur «saint est son nom» est surprenant. Ce n'est pas la mise en évidence de la composition du texte qui pourra fournir une explication de ce fait. L'analyse formelle établit seulement le fait, et permet donc de poser correctement l'énigme, ce qui est déjà beaucoup. Une autre étape doit maintenant commencer qui sera de saisir le rapport entre le centre et le reste du texte. Ce rapport n'est pas toujours universel ou naturel, il est le plus souvent culturel ou propre au monde de la Bible. Pour saisir la relation entre «saint est son nom» et l'ensemble du Magnificat, il est nécessaire de savoir ce que signifie la sainteté dans la tradition d'Israël.

La sainteté n'a pas seulement, ni peut-être surtout, le sens de séparation du profane et de pureté légale⁽⁴⁶⁾. «Saint» est d'abord un nom de Dieu: «le Saint d'Israël» est équivalement son «sauveur» (Is 43,3) ou son «rédeempteur» (Is 43,14; 48,17; 54,5). La sainteté n'est donc pas tellement un état ou un attribut divin qu'une action de Dieu en faveur de son peuple, action de délivrance qui comporte deux aspects complémentaires: «force», «puissance», «grande et redoutable» contre les ennemis d'Israël et «miséricorde» pour ceux qui sont écrasés par eux (voir par ex. Is 41,8-20 avec les «refrains»

⁽⁴⁴⁾ «Le nombril» comme dit malicieusement J. DUPONT, «Le Magnificat», 330, note 18, sans se douter qu'il a peut-être plus raison qu'il ne le pense: l'ombilic, ouverture primordiale définitivement close, pourrait être un bon symbole de l'énigme que pose toujours le centre d'un texte chiasmatique (voir D. VASSE, *L'ombilic et la voix* [Paris 1974]).

⁽⁴⁵⁾ *Analytical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans Tracing the Train of Thought by the Aid of Parallelism* (Edimbourg 1868) 82.

⁽⁴⁶⁾ Voir les art. «saint», «sainteté» et «sanctification» dans le *Dictionnaire de la Bible* de VIGOUROUX.

de 14, 16 et 20 où est repris «le Saint d'Israël»; voir aussi Is 5,15-16; 8,13; 12; Ps 99 et 111). Corrélativement, Israël est saint parce que racheté: «On les appellera» «le Peuple Saint», «les rachetés de Yahwé» (Is 62,12). Alors «il sanctifiera mon nom, il sanctifiera le Saint de Jacob, il redoutera le Dieu d'Israël» (Is 29,23), il le «craindra» (Is 8,13); en revanche, si Israël est infidèle au Dieu qui l'a sauvé, s'il «souille» la terre qu'il lui a donnée, alors lui aussi encourra la colère et le châtement de Dieu: Dieu «manifestera ainsi sa sainteté à leurs yeux» (Ez 38,16). Ayant ainsi par la punition reçue «profané le saint nom de Dieu» parmi les nations, Dieu le sauvera à nouveau en le délivrant de ses ennemis et en le purifiant «pour sanctifier son nom» (Ez 36)⁽⁴⁷⁾.

Dans le Magnificat, les deux aspects complémentaires de la «sainteté» de Dieu encadrent immédiatement le centre: il est «puissant» (49a) et «miséricordieux» (50). Le «sauveur» (47) manifeste sa «force» (51) contre les «orgueilleux», «les puissants», «les riches» (51-52) en «secourant Israël» (54). Les «abaissés» (ou les humiliés) dont Marie est la figure et l'héritière sont ceux qui étaient esclaves en Egypte, asservis durant l'exil.

La même séparation, le même jugement entre les ennemis et les sauvés du Dieu Saint se retrouve dans le chant d'Anne (1 Sam 2,1-10). L'analyse rhétorique de ce texte montrera que la parenté n'est pas seulement thématique.

Le texte⁽⁴⁸⁾ est de construction concentrique (voir traduction, Planche 4 p. 69). Aux extrémités, deux courts passages (1bc et 10d)

עלץ לבי ב יהוה	רמה קרני ביהוה		
רחב פי על - אויבי	כי שמחתי בישועתך		
ויתן יָעוּז למלכו	וירם קרן משיחו		

⁽⁴⁷⁾ La relation entre les deux demandes extrêmes du Notre Père peut alors se mieux comprendre: c'est en nous délivrant du mauvais que Dieu sanctifie son nom (pour la construction concentrique du Notre Père, voir *Initiation à la rhétorique biblique*, 177s et Planche 29). Sur le sens de la sainteté, voir MINGUEZ, «Poética», 66, note 16 (bibliographie, dont récemment M. GILBERT, «Le sacré dans l'Ancien Testament», dans *L'expression du sacré dans les grandes religions I*, [Proche-Orient ancien et traditions bibliques, Homo religiosus 1; Louvain-la-Neuve 1978] 205-286).

⁽⁴⁸⁾ Contrairement à D. N. FREEDMAN, «Psalm 113 and the Song of Han-

qui se distinguent des autres par l'emploi de pronoms de première personne au début et par la mention du «Roi / «Christ» de Dieu à la fin, pronoms et mention qui ne se retrouvent nulle part ailleurs. «Est élevée ma corne» et «il élève la corne» forment inclusion.

Les deuxième et avant dernière parties (2-3 et 8c-10c) sont de construction analogue:

2 .	אין - קדוש כ	יהוה
כי .	אין בלת כ	
1 .	אין צור כ	אלהינו
3 אל - תרבו .		
	תרברו גבהה גבהה	
	יצא עתק מפיכם	
כי אל דעות יהוה וליא נתכנו עללות		
כי ליהוה מצקי ארץ וישת עליהם תבל		
9 רגל חסידו ישמר .		
ורשעים בחשך ידמו .		
כי ליא בכח יגבר - איש .		
10 יהוה יחתו מריבו .		
עלו בשמים ירעם .		
יהוה ידין אפסי ארץ .		

l'une commence avec un double tristique⁽⁴⁹⁾ et s'achève sur un distique synonymique, l'autre au contraire commence par un distique

nah», *Eretz-Israel* 14 (1978) 56-69 qui reconstruit le texte sur la base de sa structure poétique, notre analyse, menée indépendamment de la sienne, suit à la lettre le TM. Les deux approches se rejoignent sur plus d'un point. Pour le deuxième stique de 5, nous suivons la lecture de P. K. McCARTER, *1 Samuel. A New Translation* (AB 8; Garden City, NY 1980). On pourrait traduire aussi: «les affamés s'arrêtent (de travailler) pour toujours».

⁽⁴⁹⁾ Le premier est de construction concentrique; nous interprétons le deuxième, difficile à comprendre, comme un tristique (à cause des trois ver-

synonymique suivi d'un triple distique (9-10c). Le distique par lequel s'achève le passage 2-3 se distingue clairement de ce qui le précède à cause de son rythme binaire opposé au rythme ternaire des deux tristiques; le distique par lequel commence 8c-10c se distingue de la suite parce qu'il est le seul du passage à ne pas mettre en relation l'homme et Dieu. A remarquer enfin l'inclusion formée par le nom de «Yahwé» pour le premier passage et l'inclusion formée par «Yahwé» et «de la terre» pour le deuxième passage. «Yahwé» se retrouve, avec «l'homme» au centre de la série des trois distiques (9c-10a).

La partie centrale (4-8b) est construite en chiasme:

ונכשלים אורו חיל	גברים חתים	4 קשת
ורעבים חרלו עד -	בלחם נשכרו	5 שבועים
ורפית בנים אמללה	ילדה שבעה	עקרה
מוריד שאול ויעל	ומחיה	6 יהוה ממית
משפיל אף - מרומם	ומעשיר	7 יהוה מוריש
מאשפת ירים אביון	דל	8 מקים מעפר
וכסא כבוד ינחלם	נדיבים	9 להושיב עם -

Chacun des trois premiers distiques (4-5) oppose les «forts», «rassasiés» et «nombreuse» aux «chancelants», «affamés» et «stérile»; le dernier distique se distingue cependant des deux premiers par l'ordre des éléments et par l'emploi du singulier au lieu du pluriel. Chacun des deux derniers distiques (8a et 8b) est synonymique; les deux distiques sont complémentaires. Les deux morceaux disent donc globalement la même chose; cependant, du point de vue formel, alors que l'un est ternaire, l'autre est binaire, alors que dans l'un l'opposition

bes) qui répond au premier formellement de même qu'au niveau du sens: la multiplication s'oppose à l'unicité triplement affirmée (2); la suite expliciterait le contenu de «ne multipliez pas»; les deux ensembles qui s'achèvent sur l'opposition «notre» - «votre» pourraient opposer ce que disent les justes (2) et ce qu'ils disent aux impies de ne pas dire (3a-c).

se trouve entre les premiers et les seconds stiques, dans l'autre le deuxième stique se sert de termes antithétiques pour compléter le premier; par ailleurs, dans le deuxième morceau, il n'est pas question de l'abaissement de ceux qui sont élevés, mais seulement de l'élévation des démunis.

Enfin, au cœur de la partie centrale (6-7), deux distiques de même construction syntaxique⁽⁵⁰⁾. Les quatre distiques contiennent une opposition du même ordre que celle qui oppose les stiques précédents deux par deux et les deux distiques suivants, et ils se distinguent d'eux en outre parce qu'ils ne nomment pas les bénéficiaires des actions de Dieu; ce qui leur donne un caractère de formule absolue.

Ainsi le chant d'Anne met-il en valeur, au centre de la construction (avec les mêmes mots en finale), la même opposition sur laquelle est centré le deuxième versant du Magnificat. La partie en «je» se trouve par contre ici répartie entre l'introduction et la conclusion⁽⁵¹⁾. L'équivalent du segment central du Magnificat est placé tout au début du corps du chant d'Anne (2).

4. Lc 1,25-26 comme ensemble

4.1 *Composition du texte* (suivre sur la Planche 5, p. 70-71)

La conclusion comprend un seul verset (56): ses deux phrases coordonnées par «et» forment un binaire parallèle où les verbes s'opposent ainsi que les compléments «avec elle» et «dans sa maison», ce qui laisse au centre le complément de temps «environ trois mois»:

56 Ἐμεινεν δὲ Μαριάμ σὺν	αὐτῇ
	ὥς μῆνας τρεῖς
καὶ ὑπέστρεψεν	εἰς τὸν οἶκον αὐτῆς

⁽⁵⁰⁾ Le deuxième économise «au Chéol».

⁽⁵¹⁾ Dans la bouche d'Anne, le premier verset la désigne et le dernier distique peut désigner son fils. Si l'on admet, avec plusieurs, que ce poème est un psaume messianique, le début et la fin désignent la même personne, le roi qui exprime sa gratitude au Seigneur qui l'a sauvé de ses ennemis.

Les cinq parties du texte forment un seul tableau, de composition concentrique. Les versets 26-27 n'entrent pas dans la construction rhétorique de l'Annonciation, de même que le verset 56 n'appartient pas à la dernière péricope; par contre, les versets 39-40 qui, du point de vue du récit, introduisent la Visitation et correspondent ainsi à 26-27, font partie intégrante de la construction rhétorique de la péricope centrale; d'un passage à l'autre, «sixième mois» au tout début de l'introduction et «trois mois» au centre de la conclusion.

Le Magnificat est symétrique de l'Annonciation par sa position. Les deux passages sont aussi symétriques par leur contenu: ils ont en effet beaucoup de points communs: «Israël» (54) est l'autre nom de «Jacob» et «la maison de Jacob» (33) désigne le peuple d'Israël dont il est question dans le Magnificat. «Pour les siècles» et son correspondant «n'aura pas de fin» (33) sont repris avec «pour des générations et des générations» (50) et «pour les siècles» (55). Celui qui a renversé les puissants de leurs «trônes» (52) donnera le «trône» de David à Jésus (32). «Le Puissant» (49) est celui qui couvre Marie de sa «puissance» (35). Marie est «la servante du Seigneur» (38 et 47) comme Israël est «son serviteur» (54). La stérilité est considérée comme une humiliation, un «abaissement»: Elisabeth «la stérile» (36) en est sauvée, comme Marie (48) et Israël (52). Enfin et surtout, ce qui est dit de Dieu dans le Magnificat l'est de Jésus dans l'Annonciation. «Saint» qui est le «nom» de Dieu (49b) est le nom par lequel «sera appelé» Jésus (35d):

ἅγιον	κληθήσεται
ἅγιον	τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ

«Grand» (32a) qui est symétrique de «saint» (35d) est repris par l'inclusion du premier versant du Magnificat («grandit», c'est à dire «reconnait-pour-Grand» en 46 auquel fait écho «grandeurs» en 49a); il n'est pas jusqu'à «sauveur» de 47 qui ne rappelle que le nom dont «Jésus» sera appelé (31) signifie «sauveur».

Le récit de la Visitation se trouve ainsi au centre de l'ensemble; et au centre du centre est ainsi doublement mise en relief la double bénédiction de Marie et de Jésus par Elisabeth.

Les trois péripécopes de l'Annonciation, de la Visitation et du Magnificat s'achèvent sur une mention explicite d'une parole de Dieu (*rhèma* en 38 et *lalein* en 45 et 55). Ces deux derniers verbes

en particulier mettent en parallèle Marie et Abraham; Marie est désignée comme «celle qui a cru» en 45, ce qui est l'épithète de nature d'Abraham (55)⁽⁵²⁾.

4.2 *Pour l'interprétation*

4.2.1 *A l'intérieur du texte*

Il ne sera pas besoin d'insister beaucoup pour montrer le bénéfice qu'une telle construction peut apporter pour l'interprétation du texte. La relation que Laurentin établit entre les deux occurrences du mot «saint» appliqué à Jésus comme à Dieu⁽⁵³⁾ se trouve ici fortement consolidée. Dans la même ligne on pourra suivre les autres titres de Jésus dans l'ensemble du texte, avec «grand», «fils du Très-Haut»/«fils de Dieu» et même «Béni»: si Marie sera «bénie entre toutes les femmes», à plus forte raison Jésus sera Béni à un titre tout à fait unique, comme il est fils à titre tout à fait unique; il est en effet dit «Seigneur» (43) et son nom signifie «sauveur». Jésus et Dieu sont distincts mais ils sont un.

Les «final terms» des trois péripécies mettent en relation «la parole» (38) «dite» aujourd'hui à Marie (45) avec celle qui fut «dite» jadis en faveur d'Abraham (55): en Marie se réalise la promesse à Abraham et à sa descendance, la maison de Jacob. Tout le texte, du reste, qui met en parallèle ce qui va se passer avec Marie (28-38) et ce que Dieu a fait depuis Abraham (50-55) va dans le même sens. Enfin au centre du texte est figurée, est réalisée, dans la rencontre de Jean et de Jésus à travers leurs deux mères, la jonction entre les deux Testaments. L'Ancien et le Nouveau sont distincts et ils sont un.

4.2.2. *En parallèle avec l'Annonciation à Zacharie*

Il ne peut être question de faire ici un parallèle exhaustif entre les deux textes, car cela supposerait que soit faite l'analyse rhétorique

⁽⁵²⁾ Dans notre analyse antérieure du Magnificat, nous avons déjà remarqué la symétrie de «celle qui a cru» + «dit» avec «dit» + «Abraham», mais nous l'avons interprétée comme les extrémités d'un chiasme, ce qui était une erreur. Ce sont des «final terms» (cf. *supra*, note 29).

⁽⁵³⁾ *Structure*, 122; adopté par LEGRAND, *L'annonce*, 291.

du premier. Nous relèverons seulement les points qui nous semblent les plus saillants. Outre les différences habituellement notées entre les deux annonces, trois oppositions, liées entre elles, sont particulièrement fortes. Tout d'abord, alors qu'il est plusieurs fois dit explicitement que l'ange est «apparu» (11.22) à Zacharie, pour Marie il «entre» simplement; tous deux sont également troublés, mais pour Zacharie c'est en «voyant» Gabriel (12), pour Marie c'est «à sa parole» (29). Nulle part tout au long de 26-56 il n'est dit que Marie a vu quelqu'un ou quelque chose; elle entend seulement. De même pour Elisabeth: c'est en entendant la voix de Marie que l'enfant tressaille dans son sein; ce n'est pas à sa vue. La deuxième opposition concerne la foi: alors que l'ange prononce contre Zacharie une sorte de malédiction temporaire parce qu'il «n'a pas cru» à ses paroles (20), Elisabeth bénit Marie: «Heureuse celle qui a cru à ce qui lui a été dit» (45). Ces deux oppositions entre la vue et l'écoute et entre la foi et l'incrédulité sont liées⁽⁵⁴⁾. Enfin, conséquences opposées des deux attitudes de Zacharie et de Marie, alors que l'un est réduit au silence, l'autre peut laisser éclater longuement sa joie dans le Magnificat.

Tous deux alors retournement «dans leur maison» (23 et 56)⁽⁵⁵⁾.

Conclusion

L'objet de cette étude était de démontrer que ce n'est pas seulement le récit de l'Annonciation à Marie qui est parallèle à l'Annonciation à Zacharie, mais tout l'ensemble Annonciation à Marie + Visitation + Magnificat, et cela tant pour des raisons de cohérence interne de ce dernier ensemble que pour des raisons externes de parallélisme des deux ensembles 5-25 et 26-56.

Cependant, quel que soit le bien fondé de nos arguments, cette démonstration demeurera une hypothèse tant que ces deux unités ne

⁽⁵⁴⁾ L'opposition entre voir et écouter (en liaison avec incrédulité - foi) est fréquente chez Luc, par ex. 8,20-21; 9,9; 11,29-32; 23,8.

⁽⁵⁵⁾ Les deux textes s'achèvent ainsi de façon analogue (de même que 2,21-40 et 2,41-52). Là est la véritable conclusion de l'Annonciation (LEGRAND, *L'annonce*, 83, rappelle que Loisy et Dibelius avaient remarqué que le récit de 26-38 restait sans conclusion).

seront pas intégrées dans un ensemble plus vaste, celui de la première section de l'Evangile de Luc. Si nous pensons avoir prouvé, contre Laurentin et ses successeurs, que la Visitation et le Magnificat ne sont pas un «épisode complémentaire» aux deux Annonciations parallèles, il reste à étudier le statut du deuxième épisode complémentaire, «Jésus perdu et retrouvé au Temple» (2,40-52). Dans une analyse rhétorique tout se tient. Et les problèmes de découpage, comme dans toute analyse linguistique proprement dite, sont primordiaux.

Il nous semble qu'on accepte trop facilement et sans le démontrer que Luc 1-2 forme une section. Ce qui peut sembler aller de soi du point de vue du récit n'est pas évident du point de vue rhétorique, c'est à dire du point de vue de la construction littéraire, et en définitive théologique, de l'Evangile. Les deux critères majeurs invoqués en faveur de ce découpage sont, le premier, que ce sont les récits «de l'enfance» (appelés même «Evangile de l'Enfance») et, le deuxième, que ces récits établissent un parallèle entre Jean et Jésus. On remarque cependant que la dernière scène, «Jésus perdu et retrouvé», n'appartient pas tout à fait aux enfances puisque Jésus, à douze ans, passe de l'enfance à l'âge adulte. Par ailleurs, le parallèle, et la rencontre, entre Jean et Jésus ne se limite pas aux deux premiers chapitres: après les deux scènes au Temple (Présentation et Perte et recouvrement) qui n'ont pas d'équivalent dans la vie de Jean, Luc revient de nouveau à Jean-Baptiste (3,1-20) puis à Jésus (3,21-4,13) avant que ne commence à proprement parler le ministère de Jésus.

Le «plan» de Luc 1-2 est donc à reconsidérer dans un ensemble plus vaste où le deuxième «épisode complémentaire» (2,41-52) aurait, avec son pendant (2,30-40), une autre place et un autre statut. C'est à cette révision radicale que conduit l'analyse rhétorique.

Université St Joseph
B. P. 293 Beyrouth
Liban

Roland MEYNET

Luc 1, 28-38

- 28 Etant entré chez elle, il dit:
 . "Réjouis-toi, Marie,
 . A cette parole, elle fut troublée
 - 30 L'ange
 lui dit:

"NE crains pas, Marie, car tu as trouvé grâce CHEZ DIEU.

- . 31 VOICI que tu CONCEVRAS en ton sein
 . et tu enfanteras un FILS
 . et tu l'appelleras du nom de Jésus

32 Celui-ci sera GRAND ET SERA APPELE FILS DU TRES-HAUT

- . Le Seigneur Dieu lui donnera le trône de David son père
 . 33 et il règnera sur la maison de Jacob pour les siècles
 . et son règne n'aura pas de fin."

34 Marie dit à l'ange:

"COMMENT CELA SE FERA-T-IL PUISQUE JE NE CONNAIS PAS D'HOMME ?

35 Répondant, l'ange lui dit:

- . "L'Esprit Saint viendra sur toi
 . et la puissance du Très-Haut te couvrira de son ombre. C'est pourquoi

celui-qui-va-naître SAINT SERA APPELE FILS DE DIEU, 36

- . Et voici qu'Elisabeth ta parente A CONCU elle aussi un FILS dans sa vieillesse
 . et c'est son sixième mois à elle qu'on appelait 'La Stérile'."

37 Car NE sera impuissante CHEZ DIEU aucune parole."

- 38 Marie dit:
 . "Voici la servante du Seigneur;
 . qu'il m'arrive selon ta parole."
 - Et l'ange la quitte.

- . 39 Marie s'étant levée en ces jours-là, partit en hâte vers le haut pays dans une ville de Juda.
- . 40 Elle entra dans la maison de Zacharie et elle salua Elisabeth.

= 41 Et IL ARRIVA LORSQU' Elisabeth entendit LA SALUTATION de Marie
 = que L'ENFANT TRESSAILLIT (de jubilation) DANS SON SEIN.

- Et fut remplie de l' ESPRIT-SAINT ELISABETH
- 42 et elle poussa un grand cri

et dit:

"BENIE ES-TU ENTRE LES FEMMES
 ET
 BENI LE FRUIT DE TON SEIN !

- 43 Et d'ou me (vient) ceci
- que vienne la mère de MON SEIGNEUR vers MOI !

= 44 Car voici LORSQU'EST ARRIVEE la voix de TA SALUTATION à mes oreilles
 = que L'ENFANT A TRESSAILLI de jubilation DANS MON SEIN.

- . 45 Heureuse celle qui a cru
- . qu'aboutirait ce qui lui a été dit de la part du Seigneur."

46 Marie dit:

+ "Elle grandit	mon âme	LE SEIGNEUR 47
et		
+ il jubile	mon esprit en	DIEU mon Sauveur
- 48 PARCE QU'il a regardé L'ABAISSEMENT de SA SERVANTE.		
<hr/>		
+ Voici en effet qu'	à partir de maintenant	
+ me diront heureuse	toutes les générations	
- 49 PARCE QU'il a fait pour moi DES GRANDEURS LE PUISSANT.		

ET

SAINT

SON NOM.

+ 50 Et SA MISERICORDE
: pour des générations
: et des générations
= en faveur de ceux qui le craignent.

51 Il a fait	force par	SON BRAS:
	il a dispersé	
	. les orgueilleux	de leurs coeurs, 52
	il a renversé	
	. les puissants	de leurs trônes

ET IL A ELEVE
LES ABAISSES.⁵³

. les affamés	
il a remplis	et de biens
. les riches	
il a renvoyés	vides.

54 Il a secouru	Israël	SON SERVITEUR,
-----------------	--------	----------------

+ se souvenant de SA MISERICORDE
= 55 comme il avait dit à nos pères
= en faveur d'Abraham et de sa descendance
: pour les siècles."

1Sam 2, 1-10

1 Alors Anne pria et dit:

A exulté	mon coeur en	Yahwé	est ELEVEE MA CORNE	en Yahwé
Est élargie	ma bouche contre	mes ennemis	car je me suis réjouie	en ton salut

. 2	Il n'y a pas de Saint	comme YAHWE
. Car il n'y a pas		excepté toi
. et il n'y a pas de Rocher		comme notre Dieu

. 3	Ne multipliez pas	
. (ne)	dites des choses hautaines	
. (ne)	sorte l'insolence	de votre bouche

- CAR	Dieu des connaissances	est	YAHWE
- et	pour lui	sont estimées	les actions

+ 4	Les arcs des FORTS	ils sont brisés	les CHANCELANTS	ceindront la vigueur
+ 5	Les	RASSASTES pour du pain se louent	les AFFAMES	sont engraisées de nourriture
+ La	STERILE	enfante sept fois	la NOMBREUSE	de fils languit

6	YAHWE	FAIT-MOURIR et FAIT-VIVRE	il FAIT-DESCENDRE au Chéol et FAIT-MONTER
7	YAHWE	DEPOSSEDE et ENRICHIT	il ABAISSE et IL ELEVE

+ 8	Il fait-lever de la poussière	le PAUVRE	et des ordures il élève	l'INDIGENT
+ pour	les faire-assembler avec	les NOBLES	et d'un trône de gloire	les fait-HERITER

- CAR à	YAHWE	les colonnes	DE LA TERRE
- il	pose	sur elles	le monde

. 9	Les pieds de ses fidèles	il garde
. et les impies dans la ténèbre		se taisent
. Car ce n'est pas par la robustesse	qu'est fort l'homme	
. 10	Yahwé, ils sont brisés	ceux qui s'opposent à Lui
. Contre eux dans les cieux	il fait-tonner	
. YAHWE jugera les confins	DE LA TERRE	

Et il donne la puissance à son Roi	il ELEVE LA CORNE de son Christ
------------------------------------	---------------------------------

26 Le sixième mois, l'ange Gabriel fut envoyé de la part de Dieu dans une ville de Galilée du nom de Nazareth
27 à une vierge fiancée à un homme du nom de Joseph de la maison de David et le nom de la vierge était Marie.

28 Etant entré chez elle, il dit: "Réjouis-toi COMBLEE DE GRACE, le Seigneur est avec toi.
29 A cette parole, elle fut troublée et se demandait quelle était cette salutation. 30 L'ange lui dit:
"Ne crains pas, Marie, car tu as trouvé grâce chez Dieu. 31 Voici que tu concevras en ton sein et tu enfanteras un fils
et tu l'appelleras du nom de JESUS: 32

CELUI-CI SERA	GRAND	ET SERA APPELE	FILS DU TRES-HAUT.
---------------	-------	----------------	--------------------

Le Seigneur Dieu lui donnera le trône de David son père; 33 il règnera sur la maison de Jacob pour les siècles
et son règne n'aura pas de fin."
34 Marie dit à l'ange: "COMMENT CELA SE FERA-T-IL, PUISQUE JE NE CONNAIS PAS D'HOMME?"
35 Répondant, l'ange lui dit: "L'Esprit Saint viendra sur toi et la puissance du Très-Haut te couvrira de son ombre:

CELUI-QUI-NAITRA	SAINT	IL SERA APPELE	FILS DE DIEU.
------------------	-------	----------------	---------------

c'est pourquoi
36 Et voici qu'Elisabeth ta parente a conçu elle aussi un fils dans sa vieillesse et
c'est son sixième mois à elle qu'on appelait LA STERILE, 37 car aucune parole ne sera impuissante chez Dieu."
38 Marie dit: "Voici LA SERVANTE du Seigneur, qu'il m'arrive selon ta parole." Et l'ange la quitta.

39 Marie s'étant levée en ces jours-la partit en hâte vers le haut-pays dans une ville de Juda.
 40 Elle entra dans la maison de Zacharie et elle salua Elisabeth.
 41 Et il arriva lorsqu'Elisabeth entendit la salutation de Marie que l'enfant tressaillit dans son sein
 et Elisabeth fut remplie de l'Esprit Saint 42 et elle poussa un grand cri et dit:

"BENIE es-tu entre les femmes
 et
 BENI le fruit de ton sein !

43 Et d'où me vient ceci que la mère de mon Seigneur vienne à moi !
 44 Car voici lorsqu'est arrivée la voix de ta salutation à mes oreilles, l'enfant a tressailli de jubilation
 en mon sein. 45 Heureuse CELLE QUI A CRU qu'aboutirait ce qui lui a été dit de la part du Seigneur."

46 Marie dit: "Elle reconnaît-pour- GRAND mon âme le Seigneur 47 et jubile mon esprit en Dieu mon Sauveur
 48 car il a regardé L'ABAISSEMENT DE SA SERVANTE.
 Voici en effet qu'à partir de maintenant me DIRONT-HEUREUSE
 49 Car il a fait pour moi des GRANDEURS le Puissant.

ET SAINT SON NOM,

50 Et sa miséricorde pour des générations et

des générations en faveur de ceux qui le craignent. 51 Il a fait force par son bras: il a dispersé les orgueilleux
 de coeur, 52 il a renversé les puissants de leurs trônes
 et IL A ELEVE

LES ABAISSES. 53 Les affamés il les a remplis de biens et les riches
 il les a renvoyés vides. 54 Il a secouru ISRAEL SON SERVITEUR, se souvenant de sa miséricorde
 55 comme il l'avait dit à nos pères en faveur d'ABRAHAM et de sa descendance pour les siècles."

56 Marie demeura avec elle environ trois mois
 puis elle retourna dans sa maison.

SUMMARY

The Visitation and the Magnificat (Luke 1,39-56) are generally thought to be a "complementary episode" of the diptych of the two annunciations to Zachary and to Mary. But rhetorical analysis shows that Luke 1,26-56 forms a literary whole which is tightly structured: the names of God in the Magnificat, in particular "Holy" at the center of the canticle, are those which are given to Jesus at the moment of the Annunciation. The Visitation, at the heart of the structure, hints that Jesus is, as God, "The Blessed One". (A rhetorical analysis of the Canticle of Hannah — 1 Sam 2,1-10 — made in accord with the analysis of the Magnificat highlights not only the thematic relationships which exist between the two canticles but the structural ones as well.) The entire section 26-56 is to be placed in parallel to the Annunciation to Zachary.

On the Gattung of Q: A Dialogue with James M. Robinson

1. Introduction

In his 1981 Presidential Address to the Society of Biblical Literature James M. Robinson writes that "The bulk of the NT, written in the second half of the first century A.D. . . , is thus strung on trajectories that lead not only from the pre-Pauline confession of 1 Cor 15:3-5 to the Apostles' Creed of the second century, but also from Easter 'enthusiasm' to second-century gnosticism"⁽¹⁾. This Easter "enthusiasm" is shored up primarily by an apocalyptic radicalism at the heart of which lies the belief in the imminent return of the resurrected Lord. It is this movement from the apocalypticism of Easter to the gnosticism of Valentinus (or to the Apostles' Creed) which Robinson carefully and compellingly uses to account for three developments in the early church. The first is the transformation of the original resurrection appearances of Jesus as a heavenly and luminous body into what emerged as the catholic (bodily and non-luminous appearances) and gnostic (non-bodily, spiritual apparitions) representations of the resurrected Lord. The second is the translation of an originally apocalyptic expectation of a future bodily resurrection into catholic (a future bodily resurrection *from the dead*) and gnostic (a resurrection of spiritual self at baptism) alternatives. The third is the evolution of the original sayings tradition of Jesus into catholic (emphasizing the sayings as sayings of the historical Jesus: Q, Mark, Matthew, Luke) and gnostic (emphasizing sayings as sayings of the resurrected Lord: *Gospel of Thomas* = *Gos Thom*) collections.

With respect to this third point, Robinson had already worked out in 1971 details of the *Gattungsgeschichte* of the sayings tradition in his "*Logoi Sophōn*: on the *Gattung* of Q", presenting Q as part

(¹) James M. ROBINSON, "Jesus: From Easter to Valentinus (or to the Apostles' Creed)", *JBL* 101 (1983) 6.

of a literary type or genre styled "Sayings of the Sages"⁽²⁾. In 1983 Robinson returned to this topic again in a paper delivered to the NEH Working Seminar on Gnosticism and Early Christianity at Springfield, Missouri⁽³⁾. There Robinson assessed recent proposals for identifying the genre of Q as a testament, a prophetic book, a testimony collection, and a wisdom book⁽⁴⁾. Having surveyed this range of opinion, Robinson concluded that two newer developments have complicated the search for Q's genre, namely redaction critical studies⁽⁵⁾ that have proposed a series of editions for Q and the analyses of early Christianity's social history that have linked Q to groups of itinerant and mendicant preachers⁽⁶⁾. What, then, is Q

(2) James M. ROBINSON, "Logoi Sophōn: On the Gattung of Q", *The Future of Our Religious Past* (ed., J. M. ROBINSON; New York 1971) 84-130.

(3) James M. ROBINSON, "On Bridging the Gulf from Q to the Gospel of Thomas (or vice versa)". A revision of this paper will appear in the seminar's proceedings *Gnosticism and Early Christianity* (eds., C. W. HEDRICK and R. HODGSON, Jr.; Boston and Leiden; forthcoming).

(4) Testament: E. BÄMMEL, "Das Ende von Q", *Verborum Veritas* (ed. O. BÖCHER and K. HAACHER (Wuppertal 1970) 39-50; prophetic book: M. E. BORING, *Sayings of the Risen Jesus: Christian Prophecy in the Synoptic Tradition* (SNTSMS 46; Cambridge 1982) 180-181; testimony collection: R. HODGSON, "On the Gattung of Q: A Dialogue with James M. Robinson", unpublished paper presented at regional meetings of SBL Spring, 1983; wisdom book: H. KOESTER, *Tradition and History of the Early Christian Gospel Literature*, Shaffer Lectures (Yale University 1980).

(5) R. A. EDWARDS, *A Theology of Q: Eschatology, Prophecy, Wisdom* (Philadelphia 1976); IDEM., *The Sign of Jonah in the Theology of the Evangelists and Q* (SBT 18; London 1971); IDEM., *A Concordance to Q* (SBS 7; Missoula, Mont. 1975); D. LÜHRMANN, *Die Redaktion der Logienquelle* (WMANT 33; Neukirchen 1969); G. N. STANTON, "On the Christology of Q", *Christ and Spirit in the New Testament* (ed. B. LINDARS, S.S.F. and S. S. SMALLEY; Cambridge 1973) 27-42; H. CHADWICK, "Florilegium", *RAC* (1969) cols. 1131-1159; H. C. KEE, *Jesus in History* (New York 1977) 76-120; S. SCHULZ, *Q-Die Spruchquelle der Evangelisten* (Zürich 1972); W. SCHENK, *Synopse zur Redenquelle der Evangelien: Q-Synopse und Rekonstruktion in deutscher Übersetzung mit kurzen Erläuterungen* (Düsseldorf 1981).

(6) G. THEISSEN, *Sociology of Early Palestinian Christianity*, tr. J. BOWDEN (Philadelphia 1978); L. SCHOTTROFF and W. STEGEMANN, *Jesus von Nazareth: Hoffnung der Armen* (Stuttgart 1978); W. STEGEMANN, *Das Evangelium und die Armen: Über den Ursprung der Theologie der Armen im Neuen Testament* (München 1981).

now? For Robinson, the answer remains essentially what it was in 1971: a collection of sayings of Jesus the wise man, although clearly a collection with a palpable social history part of which comprises successive revisions and editions.

The following paper refines Robinson's definition of Q in two ways: first, it proposes that Q, at least in an early stage in its history, absorbed a testimony collection; second, it suggests that one ought to rewrite the social history of Q to include Phariseeism as well as wisdom speculation, apocalypticism, and incipient gnosticism. In working out this first point the paper presents the view that the OT citations and OT allusions in Q represent an ensemble of proof texts which Jesus was thought to have used during his public ministry. When post-Easter Christologies identified Jesus as the Lord of the LXX, this OT testimony tradition developed into a collection of texts of which Jesus was not just the quoter but now the author as well. This collection of words of the Lord then combined with collections of prophetic, apocalyptic, and wisdom sayings derived from Jesus to produce Q.

2. *Q as a Collection of Sapiential Sayings*

Robinson's history of the *Gattung*, "Sayings of the Sages", may be summarized as follows: Originating in collections like Proverbs and Ben Sira, but also in collections found in literature such as the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs or the Ethiopian Enoch, the *Gattung* produces Pharisaic documents such as Pirke Aboth (Sayings of the Fathers), Christian collections such as Q, as well as other collections known to gospel writers and apostolic fathers, before dying out in catholic Christianity due to the popularity of the gospel genre. The last survivals of the Christian *Gattung* appear in gnostic writings such as *Gos Thom*, though in gnostic literature, too, sayings collections eventually disappear, giving way to resurrection dialogues such as the Dialogue of the Savior.

Robinson's essay stands as a landmark in NT studies, for he has given Q an identity and an ideological home. At the same time, recent redaction and sociological studies raise fresh questions about the *Gattung* and history of religions background of Q.

Specifically, one wishes to ask two questions. First, in view of redaction critical studies (Edwards, Schulz, Lührmann) that have set forth Q as a collection of collections comprising prophetic, apocalyp-

tic, and eschatological material in such diverse forms as narrative, parable, oracle, beatitude, exhortation⁽⁷⁾, and OT testimony, does any single designation such as "Sayings of the Sages" adequately describe Q's *Gattung*, much less Q's *Gattungsgeschichte*? "Sayings of the Sages" may be too narrow a rubric⁽⁸⁾, and one might even wish to propose the more conventional Greco-Roman designation for collections of this type, namely *anthologion* or *florilegium*⁽⁹⁾. Second, recent sociological analyses of early Christianity have established the view that Q is a document behind which a community stands with its distinctive life style, with identifiable advocates, adversaries, and ideology. Can this sociological question, to the extent that it applies to Q, be resolved, however, without reference to that party of Jews whose interaction with Jesus in Galilee and Judea, and later, with early Christianity in Syria and greater Palestine has so profoundly shaped the course of Jewish and Christian history? A fuller portrait of Q's social history should probably include the Pharisee as well as the wandering, charismatic preacher, the teacher of wisdom, and the apocalyptic prophet.

3. *Q and the Testimony Hypothesis*⁽¹⁰⁾

J. Rendel Harris proposed many years ago that collections of Old Testament testimonies represented one of the earliest attempts of Christians to express their new faith in writing. Although the *Gattung* of the anthology or florilegium to which the testimony collection belongs is a very ancient and widespread one, it was not until collections of OT texts turned up among the Dead Sea Scrolls that Harris's proposal caught the attention of NT scholars. Today, there is widespread agreement that written collections of testimonia or, at least, oral testimony traditions served earliest Christianity in its preaching, teaching, and worship. Is the history of Q linked to the history and eventual disappearance of this testimony tradition in early Christianity? Did a testimony tradition thought to derive from Jesus' own use of the OT merge into a larger sayings tradition

(7) Cf. KEE, *Jesus*, 84.

(8) Cf. STANTON, "Christology", 38 n. 52.

(9) Cf. CHADWICK, "Florilegium", *RAC* 1131-1159.

(10) Cf. R. HODGSON, "The Testimony Hypothesis", *JBL* 98 (1979) 361-378.

(Q), losing its separate identity? In any event it is a striking analogy that Q itself blended into the gospel tradition, and sayings collections in general developed into resurrection dialogues such as one finds in John and the Nag Hammadi tractate *Dialogue of the Savior*.

4. *Q and the Old Testament*

Regardless of how one reconstructs Q⁽¹¹⁾ the OT citations and allusions comprise no small part of the material of the sayings source. The following list includes citations and probable allusions in Q to OT texts. Luke's text is quoted and Matthew's given in parentheses.

Old Testament Text from Q (RSV)

1. Luke 4,4 (= Matt 4,4)⁽¹²⁾ It is written, 'Man shall not live by bread alone'.
2. Luke 4,8 (= Matt 4,10)⁽¹³⁾ It is written, 'You shall worship the Lord your God, and Him only shall you serve'.

Old Testament Text (RSV)

- Deut 8,3 And He humbled you and let you hunger and fed you with manna, which you did not know... that He might make you know that man does not live by bread alone, but that man lives by everything that proceeds out of the mouth of the Lord.
- Deut 6,13 You shall fear the Lord your God; you shall serve Him and swear by His name.

⁽¹¹⁾ I have consulted the following reconstructions of Q: B. H. STREETER, *The Four Gospels: A Study of Origins* (London 1927); A. HARNACK, *The Sayings of Jesus*, trans. J. R. WILKINSON (New York 1908); T. W. MANSON, *The Mission and Message of Jesus* (New York 1938); R. A. EDWARDS, *A Theology of Q: Eschatology, Prophecy, Wisdom* (Philadelphia 1976); S. SCHULZ, *Q-Die Spruchquelle der Evangelisten* (Zürich 1972); W. SCHENK, *Synopse zur Redenquelle der Evangelien* (Düsseldorf 1981); R. P. MARTIN, *New Testament Foundations* (Grand Rapids 1975).

⁽¹²⁾ Matt 4,4 cites a fuller text from Deut 8,3 that includes "but by every word that proceeds from the mouth of God". It should be noted, too, that Q has added at Luke 4,2c = Matt 4,2b the motif of hunger, also found in Deut 8,3, to Mark's report to provide a foothold in the narrative for the citation. Cf. P. HOFFMANN, "Die Versuchungsgeschichte in der Logienquelle", *BZ* 13-14 (1969-70) 207-233; HOFFMANN, *Studien zur Geschichte der Logienquelle* (NeutAbh 8; Münster 1972). The use of *gegraptai* "it is written" is an introductory formula common in testimony collections.

⁽¹³⁾ Both Matthew and Luke read *proskynein* "worship" against the LXX instead of *phobein* "fear".

- | | |
|--|--|
| <p>3. Luke 4,10 (= Matt 4,6)⁽¹⁴⁾ For it is written, 'He will give His angels charge of you, to guard you', and 'On their hands they will bear you up, lest you strike your foot against a stone'.</p> <p>4. Luke 4,12 (= Matt 4,7)⁽¹⁵⁾ It is said, 'You shall not tempt the Lord your God'.</p> <p>5. Luke 4,18-19 (cf. Matt 13,53-54)⁽¹⁶⁾ The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because He has anointed me to preach good news to the poor. He has sent</p> | <p>Ps 91,11-12 (LXX 90,11-12) For He will give His angels charge of you to guard you in all your ways. On their hands they will bear you up, lest you dash your foot against a stone.</p> <p>Deut 6,16 You shall not put the Lord your God to the test, as you tested Him at Massah.</p> <p>Isa 61,1-2 The Spirit of the Lord God is upon me, because the Lord has anointed me to bring good tidings to the afflicted; He has sent me to bind up the brokenhearted, to</p> |
|--|--|

⁽¹⁴⁾ The *kai* "and" with which Q breaks up the continuous citation from Ps 91,11-12 into two separate quotations suggests that Q believes that the quotation stems from two different OT texts. Text collections in which the sources are not clearly identified may cause such cases of wrong or confused ascription. Cf. HODGSON, "Testimony Hypothesis", 368.

⁽¹⁵⁾ Q agrees with the LXX (*ekpeirazein* "tempt").

⁽¹⁶⁾ Matt 13,53-54 does not report a fulfillment citation in this scene, and one must be cautious about including such a text in Q. I would suggest, however, the following reason for Matthew's omission of Isa 61,1-2. In general, Matthew uses his fulfillment citations in an economical and episodic fashion, that is, a single fulfillment citation attaches itself to a single episode. Thus, into the scenes of the Annunciation (Matt 1,18-25), of the Magi (Matt 2,1-12), of the Flight to Egypt (Matt 2,13-15), of the Slaughter of the Holy Innocents (Matt 2,16-18), of the Return to Galilee (2,19-23), of the First Preaching (Matt 4,12-17), of the Healing of the Multitudes (Matt 12,15-21), and of the Triumphal Entry (Matt 21,1-11) Matthew places one fulfillment citation each. The single exception to this arrangement is Matthew 13, whose parable collection already features two fulfillment citations (Matt 13,14.35). I would suggest that Matthew does not include Isa 61,1-2 in his report of Jesus' rejection at Nazareth (Matt 13,53-58) because he did not wish to overload a context already busy with fulfillment citations. M. P. MILLER, "The Function of Isa 61,1-2 in 11 Q Melchizedek", *JBL* 88 (1969) 467-469, R. FULLER, *Foundations of New Testament Christology* (New York 1965) 170, A. S. VAN DER WOUDE and M. DEJONGE, "11Q Melchizedek and the New Testament", *NTS* 12 (1965-66) 310-326, and J. A. FITZMYER, "Further Light on Melchizedek from Qumran Cave 11 *JBL* 86 (1967) 24-41 (studies of the tradition history of Isa 61,1-2) suggest to me that the text belonged to a pre-Markan testimony tradition. FITZMYER, *The Gospel according to Luke* (AB 28; Garden City 1981) 527, finds the association of Luke 4,16-30 with a sayings source "intriguing", but in the final analysis he cannot go along with it.

- me to proclaim release to the captives and recovering of sight to the blind, to set at liberty those who are oppressed, to proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord.
6. Luke 6,27-28 (cf. Matt 5,43-44)⁽¹⁷⁾ But I say to you that hear, love (*agapan*) your enemies, do good to those who hate (*misein*) you, bless those who curse (*katarasthai*) you, pray for those who abuse you.
7. Luke 7,22-23 (= Matt 11,4-6) The blind receive their sight, the lame walk, lepers are cleansed, and the deaf hear, the dead are raised up, the poor have good news preached to them. And blessed is he who takes no offense at Me.
8. Luke 7,27 (= Matt 11,10 cf. Mark 1,2)⁽¹⁸⁾ Behold, I send My
- proclaim liberty to the captives, and the opening of the prison to those who are bound; to proclaim the year of the Lord's favor, and the day of vengeance of our God; to comfort all who mourn. . . .
- Lev 19,14.17.18 You shall not curse (*ou kakōs legein*) the deaf. . . You shall not hate (*misein*) your brother in your heart, but you shall reason with your neighbor, lest you bear sin because of him. You shall not take vengeance. . . but you shall love (*agapan*) your neighbor as yourself: I am the Lord.
- Isa 29,18-19 In that day the deaf shall hear the words of a book, and out of their gloom and darkness the eyes of the blind shall see. The meek shall obtain fresh joy in the Lord, and the poor among men shall exult in the Holy One of Israel.
- Cf. Isa 35,5-6 Then the eyes of the blind shall be opened, and the ears of the deaf unstopped; then shall the lame man leap like a hart, and the tongue of the dumb sing. . . .
- Cf. Isa 61,1-2 (see above).
- Mal 3,1 Behold, I send My messenger to prepare the way before Me,

⁽¹⁷⁾ Matt 5,43-44 reads against the LXX "you shall love your neighbor and hate your enemy". Luke's combination of blessing and cursing is a topos which Paul uses at Rom 12,14. Note in Luke 6,27-28 the sequence of love, hate, curse which Lev 19,14.17.18 reproduces, though in a slightly different order. Pace FITZMYER, *Luke*, 638.

⁽¹⁸⁾ The LXX to Mal 3,1 ("Behold I send my messenger and he will care for [*epiblepein*] my way before me") and Exod 23,20 ("And behold I send my angel before you, in order that he protect you on the way, so that he lead you into the land which I have prepared [*hetoimazein*] for you") are worth noting. S. SCHULZ, *Spruchquelle*, 232, following Stendahl, believes that Q has conflated Mal 3,1 and Exod 23,20 as they appear in the MT. Two points suggest that Matthew and Luke have gotten the Malachi text from Q rather than from Mark. First, while Mark (incorrectly) introduces the text as a passage from Isaiah, both Matthew and Luke agree on another introductory

messenger before Thy face who shall prepare Thy way before Thee.

9. Luke 9,61⁽¹⁹⁾ I will follow you, Lord, but let me first say farewell to those at my home.
10. Luke 10,5⁽²⁰⁾ (cf. Matt 10,13) Say, 'Peace be to this house'.
11. Luke 10,7 (= Matt 10,10b) And remain in the same house, eating and drinking what they provide, for the laborer deserves his wages.
12. Luke 10,13-15 (= Matt 11,20-24) Woe to you, Chorazin! Woe to you, Bethsaida! For if the mighty works done in you had been done in Tyre and Sidon, they would have repented long ago, sitting in sackcloth and

and the Lord whom you seek will suddenly come to His temple.

Cf. Exod 23,20 Behold, I send an angel before you, to guard you on the way and to bring you to the place which I have prepared.

1 Kgs 19,20 Let me kiss my father and my mother, and then I will follow you. (Elisha to Elijah).

1 Sam 25,6 Peace be to you, and peace be to your house, and peace be to all that you have.

Lev 19,13b The wages of a hired servant shall not remain with you all night until the morning.

Cf. Deut 24,14-15 You shall not oppress a hired servant who is poor... You shall give him his hire on the day he earns it, before the sun goes down.

Isa 14,12-15 How you are fallen from heaven, O Day Star, son of Dawn... You said in your heart, 'I will ascend to heaven'... you are brought down to Sheol, to the depths of the Pit.

formula: "This is he of whom it is written". That both Matthew and Luke have independently corrected Mark in an identical fashion seems less likely than the assumption that they are using Q at this point. Second, both Matthew and Luke add to Mark's Malachi text "before thee". Again, probability appears to weight against simultaneous and independent correction of Mark and in favor of a common source. FITZMYER, *Luke*, 662-663, assigns the Malachi text here to Q.

⁽¹⁹⁾ T. W. MANSON, *The Mission and Message of Jesus* (New York 1938) 364, attributes Luke 9,61-62 to Q, although the omission of these verses in Matthew causes him to consider placing them in L. Possibly Matthew has omitted these verses because their clear play on the call of Elisha by Elijah and the analogy Jesus/Elijah compromised his earlier suggestion (Matt 11,14; 17,10) that John was Elijah.

⁽²⁰⁾ Luke 10,5 is probably from Luke's own hand, but for the sake of completeness it is included here.

ashes. But it shall be more tolerable in the judgment for Tyre and Sidon than for you. And you, Capernaum, will you be exalted to heaven? You shall be brought down to Hades.

13. Luke 10,21.24⁽²¹⁾ (cf. Matt 11,25-27; 13,16-17) I thank Thee, Father, Lord of heaven and earth, that Thou hast *hidden* these things from the *wise* and *understanding* and revealed them to babes... For I tell you that many *prophets* and *kings* desired to *see* what you *see*, and did not *see* it, and to *hear* what you *hear*, and did not *hear* it.

Isa 29,14 Therefore, behold, I will again do marvelous things with this people, wonderful and marvelous; and the *wisdom* of their *wise* men shall perish, and the *discernment* of their discerning men shall be *hid*.

Cf. Isa 6,9-10 'Hear and hear, but do not understand; see and see, but do not perceive'. Make the heart of this people fat, and their ears heavy... lest they *see* with their eyes... and *understand* with their hearts.

14. Luke 11,29-32 (= Matt 12,38-42)⁽²²⁾ He began to say, 'This

Cf. Jonah 1,17; 3,5; 1 Kings 10,1-10; 2Chron 9,1-12.

⁽²¹⁾ L. CERFAUX, "Vestiges d'un florilege dans 1 Cor 1,18-3,23?", *Recueil L. Cerfaux* (2 vols.; Gembloux 1954) II, 319-332, has argued that a florilegium lies just beneath the surface of 1 Cor 1,18-3,23, having been worked up by Paul into his complaint against the Corinthian reversal of wisdom as Paul had preached it. If Cerfaux is correct, then Luke 10,21.24 = Matt 11,25-27; 13,16-17 contains Q materials possibly deriving from this pre-Pauline florilegium. Note the similarities between Luke 10,21.24 and Matt 11,25-27; 13,16-17 and 1 Cor 1,26-29; 2,6-8: "For consider your call, brethren; not many of you were *wise* according to worldly standards, not many were powerful, not many were of noble birth; but God chose what is foolish... to shame the *wise*... Yet among the mature we do impart *wisdom*, although it is not a *wisdom* of this age or of the *rulers* of this age... But we impart a secret and hidden *wisdom* of God, which God decreed before the ages (cf. Matt 13,35 = Ps 78,2)... None of the *rulers* of this age *understood* this". Cf. SCHULZ, *Spruchquelle*, 218ff and B. PEARSON, *The Pneumatikos-Psychikos Terminology* (SBL Diss 12; Missoula 1973) 33-34.

⁽²²⁾ Strictly speaking, of course, Luke 11,29-32 is neither a citation nor an allusion but a midrash on Jonah 1,17; 3,5; 1 Kgs 10,1-10. Nonetheless I include it here for two reasons. First, the Qumran florilegia show that such anthologies can contain both text and *peshet*, i.e. explication or midrash.

generation is an evil generation; it seeks a sign, but no sign shall be given to it except the sign of Jonah. For as Jonah became a sign to the men at Nineveh, so will the Son of man be to this generation. The queen of the South will arise at the judgment with the men of this generation and condemn them; for she came from the ends of the earth to hear the wisdom of Solomon... The men of Nineveh will arise at the judgment. . . .

15. Luke 11,42 (= Matt 23,23)⁽²³⁾ Cf. Mic 6,8; Lev 27,30.

But woe to you Pharisees! for you tithe mint and rue and every herb, and neglect justice and the love of God; these you ought to have done, without neglecting the others.

16. Luke 12,51-53 (= Matt 10,34-36)⁽²⁴⁾ Do you think that I have come to give peace on earth? No, I tell you, but rather division, for henceforth in one house there will be five divided, three against two and two against three; they will be divided, father against son and son against father, mother against daughter and daughter against her mother, mother-in-law against her daughter-in-law and daughter-in-law against her mother-in-law.

Mic 7,6 For the son treats the father with contempt, the daughter rises up against her mother, the daughter-in-law against her mother-in-law; a man's enemies are the men of his own house.

Second, even on the assumption that the testimony tradition included in Q contained only direct quotations and no midrashim, one must still reckon with the possibility that either the compiler(s) of Q or Matthew and Luke could translate a text into a commentary. Cf. R. A. EDWARDS, *The Sign of Jonah in the Theology of the Evangelists and Q* (SBT 18; London 1971).

⁽²³⁾ Luke 11,39 introduces this sequence as sayings of the *Lord*. Cf. n. 35.

⁽²⁴⁾ Matthew's text preserves the text of the LXX more accurately than Luke.

17. Luke 13,18-19 (= Matt 13,31-32)⁽²⁵⁾ He said therefore, 'What is the kingdom of God like? And to what shall I compare it? It is like a grain of mustard seed which a man took and sowed in his garden; and it grew and became a tree, and the birds of the air made nests in its branches'.
 18. Luke 13,27 (= Matt 7,23) But he will say, 'I tell you, I do not know where you come from; depart from me, all you workers of iniquity'!
 19. Luke 13,29 (= Matt 8,11) And men will come from east and west, and from north and south, and sit at table in the kingdom of God.
 20. Luke 13,34-35 (= Matt 23,37-39) O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, killing the prophets and stoning those who are sent to you! How often would I have gathered your children together as a hen gathers her brood... Behold, your house is forsaken. And I tell you, you will not see me until you say 'Blessed is he who comes in the name of the Lord!'
 21. Luke 17,26-27 (= Matt 24,37-39) As it was in the days of Noah, so will it be in the days of the Son of man. They ate, they
- Dan 4,20-21 The tree you saw, which grew and became strong, so that its top reached to heaven, and it was visible to the end of the whole earth; whose leaves were fair and its fruit abundant, and in which was food for all; under which beasts of the field found shade, and in whose branches the birds of the air dwelt.
- Ps 6,8 Depart from me, all you workers of evil... .
- Cf. Isa 49,12; 59,19; Mal 1,11; Ps 107,1-3.
- I Kgs 9,7 And the house which I have consecrated for my name I will cast out of my sight (Cf. Neh 9:26).
- Cf. Jer 22,5 This house shall become a desolation.
- Cf. Ps 118,26 Blessed be he who enters in the name of the Lord.
- Cf. Gen 6,5-8; 7,6-24.

⁽²⁵⁾ It is debatable whether Luke 13,18-19 belongs to Q, since the same general parable is found in Mark 4,30-32. EDWARDS, *Theology*, 129; MARTIN, *Foundations*, 150; and Manson, include it, noting that Mark 4,30-32 is an independent report. For the sake of completeness it is included in this list. The *Gospel of Thomas* contains the Parable of the Mustard Seed (logion 20). Does this mean that the parable belonged to a pre-Markan collection? Possibly, if Thomas dates to the middle of the first century as KOESTER, *Introduction to the New Testament* (Philadelphia 1982) 152 has argued.

drank, they married, they were
given in marriage. . . .

22. Luke 17,32 Remember Lot's Cf. Gen 19,26.
wife.

Surveying these twenty-two instances of OT citations and allusions in Q, one can make some preliminary observations about their selection, form, textual tradition, and organization. First, all three sections of the Hebrew canon are represented, and one may conclude that Q's interest in the OT included prophetic, wisdom, apocalyptic as well as legislative and narrative texts. Thus, to designate Q as a collection of sapiential sayings may not do full justice to the rich variety of material that shows up in the OT citations and allusions.

Second, one may divide up the OT material into citations introduced by conventional formulae ("it is written"), citations introduced without a formula but with something like "and he said", allusions to one or more OT texts, and haggadic exposition of OT narratives. Perhaps these different forms indicate several stages of interaction between the testimony tradition and Q. It may be worthwhile to note here, too, another distinction in the OT material. Some OT passages are placed on Jesus' lips as quotes (e.g. Luke 4,4.8.10.12.18-19; 7,27) while others are placed on his lips as his own words (e.g. Luke 6,27-28; 7,22-23; 12,51-53). Such a distinction presumably reveals a second kind of development in the history of the testimony tradition and Q, namely Jesus' passage from one who quotes OT texts to one who speaks and authors them.

Third, the textual tradition of many of the citations is closer to the LXX than to the MT. Compared to Matthew's fulfillment citations which stand closer to the MT⁽²⁶⁾, Matthew's Q citations have their own textual history. The same applies to the OT material in Luke's form of Q for he stands closer to the LXX than the MT, although even here certain distinctions are necessary⁽²⁷⁾. Does the influence of the LXX upon Q's OT material militate against the view that a testimony tradition has merged with Q? Would not one expect at this early stage in the history of Christianity to find a tes-

⁽²⁶⁾ Cf. K. STENDAHL, *The School of St. Matthew* (Lund 1954) 43-45; SCHULZ, *Spruchquelle*, 27-28; 102-103.

⁽²⁷⁾ Cf. T. HOLTZ *Untersuchungen über die alttestamentlichen Zitate bei Lukas* (TU 104; Berlin 1968) 172-173.

timony tradition with a closer kinship to the Hebrew text, perhaps even to the Targums? Yes, if one shares the assumption that early Palestinian Jewish Christians used the Hebrew OT, while later Hellenistic Jewish Christians opted for the Greek. But if first century Judaism, and with it earliest Christianity, are already to some degree Hellenized⁽²⁸⁾, then such a distinction makes less sense, and one is not surprised at the influence of a Greek language testimony tradition on Q.

A fourth observation deals with the context of the OT citations and allusions. In some cases, when the OT citation or allusion is removed from its present context, the narrative, while altered, remains coherent. This feature of Q may mean that at some point in the history of Q a testimony tradition has joined collections of sayings, parables, and beatitudes, and that some of the OT texts have been only loosely connected to their new narrative or saying setting. The OT material in the Temptation Narrative of Luke 4,1-13 illustrates this point. By removing vv. 4.8.12 the scene reverts from a temptation and debate narrative to a simple expansion of the Marcan temptation notice in Mark 1,12-13. Similarly, Luke 6,27-28 (On Love of One's Enemies), when removed from its position in the Sermon on the Plain, leaves behind a coherent series of sayings, as does Luke 13,27 when removed from the sequence of sayings on exclusion from the kingdom. In fact, Luke 13,22-30 is a more streamlined set of sayings without v. 27 and its repetition of "I do not know where you come from" in v. 25.

Finally, and this is perhaps a more certain clue to the influence of a testimony tradition on Q, certain groups, themes, and catchwords stand out in the list. The paper turns now to this final point and then takes up the second refinement of Robinson's thesis, the inclusion of Phariseism in Q's history.

5. *Organizational Principles in Q's Material*⁽²⁹⁾

Naturally, the list of twenty-two OT texts and allusions remains hypothetical until one can show that such a list represents a collec-

⁽²⁸⁾ Cf. M. HENGEL, *Judentum und Hellenismus* (WUNT 10; Tübingen 1969).

⁽²⁹⁾ A. D. JACOBSON, "The Literary Unity of Q", *JBL* 101 (1982) 365-389, has recently detected a "theological framework" in Q and identified it

tion that existed independently of the sayings source. Is there any unity in terms of catch words, common themes, or material agreements inherent in the list? If so, then the case for an independent testimony tradition is strengthened. It goes without saying that some of the twenty-two instances may be later accretions to the testimony-Q tradition, and that the case may rest on a demonstration that a number of the texts do cohere outside of their Q context.

One observes the following patterns in the OT texts in Q:

(1) *Tithing and table fellowship*. The link between these two themes has been compellingly worked out by Jacob Neusner, *From Politics to Piety: the Emergence of Pharisaic Judaism*⁽³⁰⁾. Among pre-Javnean Pharisees, what established and nurtured their association was table fellowship, and Pharisaic table fellowship presupposed attention to the laws of tithing and ritual purity. The OT passages of Q which seem to bear on this theme are:

- a. Luke 4,4 (Matt 4,4 = Deut 8,3 LXX) Man shall not live by bread alone.
- b. Luke 10,7 = Matt 10,10b (cf. Lev 19,13b; Deut 24,14-15) And remain in the same house, eating and drinking what they provide, for the laborer deserves his wages.
- c. Luke 11,42 (Matt 23,23; cf. Lev 27,30; Mic 6,8⁽³¹⁾) But woe

as deuteronomistic. Although Jacobson's interest lies in the matter of defending Q as a unified source for Matthew and Mark vis-à-vis recent challenges to the Two-Source Theory, his study bears upon my theme in two ways. He writes in the tradition of those for whom Q has an editorial history; and, he urges us to take seriously the influence of the OT on this editorial history. My study would point to the testimony tradition as a means whereby this influence made itself felt. I differ from Jacobson, since I suspect that the OT influence may be broader than is suggested by his category "deuteronomistic".

⁽³⁰⁾ *From Politics to Piety: The Emergence of Pharisaic Judaism* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J. 1973) 80, 84. It is true that of these OT texts and allusions only the third addresses specifically the issue of tithing, while the other four speak in disparate senses of food, eating and drinking. What unites them is a fuller and larger concern to establish the conditions for the possibility of table fellowship.

⁽³¹⁾ The importance of tithing for Pharisaic Judaism may be discerned in the wide ranging discussions of the topic in the Mishnah. Luke 11,42 is presumably not an *ad hoc* formulation but of a piece with the tradition codified in Lev 27,30, presupposed and refined in Mic 6,8, and debated in the Mishnah.

to you Pharisees! for you tithe mint and rue and every herb, and neglect justice and the love of God.

- d. Luke 13,29 = Matt 8,11, cf. (Isa 49,12; 59,19; Mal 1,11; Ps 107,3) And men will come from east and west, and from north and south, and sit at table in the kingdom of God.
- e. Luke 17,26-27 = Matt 24,37-39 (cf. Gen 6,5-8; 7,6-24) As it was in the days of Noah, so will it be in the days of the Son of Man. They ate, they drank, they married, they were given in marriage. . . .

(2) *Judgment.* Under this rubric are gathered those texts which hold forth the prospect of a future judgment and condemnation:

- a. Luke 13,27 = Matt 7,23 (cf. Ps 6,8) But he will say, 'I tell you, I do not know where you come from; depart from me, all you workers of iniquity'!
- b. Luke 10,13-15 = Matt 11,20-24 (cf. Isa 14,12-15) Woe to you, Chorazin! Woe to you Bethsaida. . . And you, Capernaum. . . You shall be brought down to Hades.
- c. Luke 11,29-32 = Matt 12,38-42 (cf. Jonah 1,17; 3,5; I Kgs 10,1-10) He began to say, 'This generation is an evil generation. . . The queen of the South will arise at the judgment and condemn them. . . '.
- d. Luke 13,34-35 = Matt 23,37-39 (cf. I Kings 9,7; Neh 9,26; Jer 22,5; Ps 118,26) O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, killing the prophets. . . Behold, your house is forsaken. . . .

(3) *Preaching the Good News.*

- a. Luke 4,18-19 (cf. Matt 13,53-54; Isa 61,1-2) The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because He anointed me to *preach good news* to the poor. . . .
- b. Luke 7,22-23 = Matt 11,4-6 (cf. Isa 29,18-19; 35,5-6; 61,1-2) The blind receive their sight, the lame walk, lepers are cleansed. . . the poor have *good news preached* to them.

These three organizational principles of table fellowship, judgment, and preaching the good news represent rubrics under which OT testimonia were apparently organized, memorized, written down, and transmitted. On the present hypothesis, this testimony collection merged with collections of narratives, parables, oracles, and beatitudes to form Q. The booming and increasingly diversified missionary enterprise of earliest Christianity, leading from Passion Narrative

to gospel, from sayings to sayings collection, from kerygma to letter, made simple testimony collections obsolete and caused them to be absorbed into a literature more suited to a missionary preaching directed increasingly to gentiles and hellenized Jews in the great cities of the empire.

The first cycle of texts, those arranged around the theme of table fellowship, have a special importance in testing this hypothesis. Assuming that the historical conflict between Jesus and the Pharisees over table fellowship, tithing, and ritual cleanliness issued in a similar conflict between Phariseism and earliest Christianity, on the one hand, and even between Palestinian Jewish Christians and Hellenistic Jewish Christians on the other (cf. Gal 2,11-14; Acts 15,29), one would have ready to hand a setting for the collecting of OT testimonia on this subject. In this connection certain features of the five texts in this group are worth calling attention to. Luke 4,4 introduces Deut 8,3 with *gegraptai* "it is written". The Hebrew equivalent *kktwb* is found, among other places, in the testimony literature of Qumran⁽³²⁾. The use of this and other similar formulae to introduce Scripture (cf. 3,4) can reflect a testimony tradition such as Q has conceivably absorbed. A probable original sense of Deut 8,3 lies in its association with the historical conflict of Jesus with the Pharisees in Galilee over table fellowship, tithing and purity. Such a text would provide a powerful commentary on the alleged shortcomings of Pharisaic table fellowship and its presuppositions as well as a rationale for the kind of table fellowship which Christians promoted⁽³³⁾. In Q it has changed the Marcan Temptation story from report to dialogue, and it has lost its original connection with the theme of tithing and table fellowship⁽³⁴⁾.

Luke 11,42 probably had an original connection with the Pharisaic-Christian dispute over tithing as a prerequisite for fellowship. If so, it was not an indictment of tithing itself but a conventional reproach of the potential for excess inherent in the system. Luke

(32) Cf. J. A. FITZMYER, *The Gospel According to Luke* (AB; Garden City 1981) 460.

(33) My friend and colleague C. W. Hedrick has suggested that Deut 8,3 is, in its intention, against table fellowship. This may well be, but I would only add that it still belongs to the discussion between Jesus and the Pharisees, even if used as a proof text to abolish table fellowship.

(34) Cf. FITZMYER, *Luke*, 508.

has recognized the traditional link between tithing and table fellowship by creating a scene for the dispute with the Pharisees that opens with "While he was speaking, a Pharisee asked him to dine with him" (Luke 11,37). Matthew, of course, has, intentionally or not, given up the tithing-table fellowship connection (cf. Matt 15,1)⁽³⁵⁾.

In Luke 13,29 a Q saying deriving from Isa 49,12 turns up toward the end of a series of sayings on exclusion from the kingdom. Originally Luke 13,29 may have served Jesus and his followers as a slogan and rationale for practicing a form of open table fellowship intended to replicate and anticipate the end time messianic banquet. In this case Matt 8,5 has retained a clearer association of the Q saying with the theme of open table fellowship, since the host is the centurion rather than Luke's "some one". If Acts 10, the story of the centurion Cornelius and Peter's vision, is related to Matt 8,5-13, then the alleged connection of the centurion scene in Matthew with the theme of table fellowship is strengthened. In Luke, however, Jesus responds to the question posed in v. 23 "Lord, will those who are saved be few?"⁽³⁶⁾.

In its present setting Luke 17,26-27 is an amplification of Mark's Apocalypse and an elaboration of the theme of the days of the Son of man (17,22). Isolated from the Synoptic Apocalypse and Q, its original relationship to the theme of table fellowship is apparent: the days of the Son of man feature eating, drinking, marrying and, by implication, not the restrictions demanded by the Pharisees. The value that such a text would have had for earliest Christianity vis à vis charges from both Pharisees and the disciples of John is apparent from Mark's report in 2,18-22 (cf. Luke 5,33-39 and Matt 9,14-17). Here the fasting of the Pharisees and John's disciples — prerequisite for their form of table fellowship — is contrasted with the behavior of Jesus and his disciples for whom such practices no longer served as qualifications for fellowship at table.

⁽³⁵⁾ Note the connection with the theme of ritual purity in Luke 11,39-41, as well as the use of the title *kyrios* to designate Jesus in v. 39 as the speaker of these sayings. The Christology implicit in this title explains the transition from a collection of OT texts thought to have been used by Jesus to a collection of OT texts authored by Jesus-kyrios. Because the introductory formula "And the Lord said" appears only in Luke, this putative transition point in the history of Q remains open to criticism.

⁽³⁶⁾ Cf. E. LOHMEYER-W. SCHMAUCH, *Das Evangelium des Matthäus* (Meyer K; Göttingen 1967) 158.

Luke 10,7⁽³⁷⁾ is in its present context part of the instructions given to the seventy (10,1-12). Originally, however, it represented the application of OT legislation regarding payment of a laborer's wages to the problem of table fellowship among itinerant preachers. If sociologists of early Christianity are correct in assuming large numbers of itinerant and mendicant preachers who chose this form of discipleship in conscious imitation of Jesus' own itinerant and mendicant lifestyle, then the problem of table fellowship is crucial. With whom did one eat? What did one eat? The answer is provided by a simple halakah on Lev 19,13b or Deut 24,14-15. You may eat whatever you wish, with whomever you wish, for the laborer deserves his or her hire. One example of how thorny the problem of table fellowship was for the itinerant preachers and their hosts is preserved in Gal 2,11-14.

Out of the above remarks has emerged the possibility of recovering an early stage in the history of Q, namely when OT testimonies gathered around the theme of table fellowship joined other collections to form Q. The task now is to turn to a second refinement of Robinson's view and to show that the conflict between Jesus and the Pharisees and, later, between Pharisees and Jewish Christians over ritual purity, table fellowship and tithing provides a concrete life setting for the development and transmission of such a testimony collection.

6. *The Herodian Pharisees*

Jacob Neusner's reconstruction⁽³⁸⁾ of the history of the Pharisees in the Herodian period furnishes a description of Pharisaic life that coheres well with the ideology of the Old Testament quotations in Q gathered around the theme of ritual purity, tithing, and table fellow-

⁽³⁷⁾ Martin, Edwards, Streeter, Harnack and Schulz include Luke 10,7 in Q, Manson does not.

⁽³⁸⁾ The following section of the paper is largely a summary of Neusner's analysis which as far as I am able to judge is the most reliable concise presentation of the issue available. For an alternative treatment of the history of the Herodian Pharisees one will turn to E. RIVKIN, *A Hidden Revolution* (Nashville 1978). In contrast to Neusner, Rivkin draws upon Ben Sira, a sapiential writing, to augment the information of Josephus, the NT, and the tannaitic literature. Rivkin's Pharisees thus assume a far more complex form historically and ideologically than Neusner's.

ship. Under Maccabean rule the Pharisees enjoyed some measure of political influence, especially under Alexandra Salome (76-67 B.C.). Josephus, in fact, determines that the actual administration of the Jewish state lay in their hands. By the middle of the first century A.D., however, the Pharisees had been largely disenfranchised from political office and influence in Syria and Palestine and had regrouped as a pious fellowship whose most distinctive public feature lay in their commitment to a scrupulous observance of Old Testament legislation regulating ritual purity and tithing of food and produce as prerequisites for table fellowship. Naturally, individuals who happened to be Pharisees influenced political life in Herodian Syria-Palestine but as a political party the Pharisees no longer existed. At most the Pharisees constituted a philosophical school (to use Josephus's own words) with distinctive ideas on the immortality of the soul and the role of fate. Practically speaking, however, Phariseism of the first-century A.D. turns on matters of ritual, not belief, and it is especially as ritualists concerned with purity and tithing that the Pharisees appear on the pages of the gospels.

Because the gospels are produced between 70 and 90 A.D. they tend to reflect the position of the Pharisees in their own time, that is post-Yavnehian Syria and Palestine when the Pharisees as the survivors of the First Jewish War did in fact hold the reins of power in their hands. In reality, the Pharisees had little or no political "clout" as a group in the first half of the first century A.D.

The traditions of the Gospels in which Pharisees are featured fall into five groups only the last one of which has any value in the reconstruction of the historical Pharisees in pre-Yavnehian Syria and Palestine:

1. Traditions in which the Pharisees are depicted as enemies of Jesus (cf. Mark 12,13-17)
2. Traditions in which the Pharisees criticize Jesus (Mark 2,15-17)
3. Traditions in which the Pharisees are condemned in general terms (Mark 8,15)
4. Traditions in which the Pharisees and Jesus are in agreement (Luke 13,31)
5. Traditions in which the Pharisees are condemned for specific practices and beliefs (Mark 2,15-22 = Matt 9,10-17 = Luke 5,29-39; Mark 7,1-13; cf. Matt 15,1-9; or Mark 7,14-23 =

Matt 15,10-20; Luke 11,37-41; Mark 2,23-28 = Matt 12,1-8 = Luke 6,1-5; Matt 23,1-36)

This last group depicts the Pharisees as a pious fellowship of Jews who met regularly at table, observed a variety of laws regulating purity, tithed food and produce, and rigorously defended Sabbath laws. Specific texts upon which Neusner builds his case are worth reviewing.

1. Mark 7,1-13 = Matt 15,1-9 = Luke 11,37-41. Mark 7,1-13 is a *Streitgespräch* over the issue of ritual purity. The Pharisees charge Jesus and his disciples with eating with unwashed hands – a charge which leads Mark then into a long aside (vv. 3-4) on other Pharisaic purifications. Jesus charges the Pharisees with lip-service, alludes to misuse of the Corban law, and adduces proof from Scripture for his position: Isa 29,13 (“This people honors me with their lips...”). Mark 7,1-13 presents the Pharisees here as a table fellowship sect concerned to protect the integrity and identity of their society by strict adherence to the laws of ritual purity. Luke’s recasting of Mark (Luke 11,37-41) underscores this understanding of the Pharisees, since he records that a Pharisee invites Jesus to dinner by way of introducing the *Streitgespräch*. And, too, Matthew and Luke’s omission of Mark 7,3-4 (the aside on the Pharisaic purifications followed by *all Jews*) suggests that they knew this was strictly speaking only a Pharisaic concern.

2. Mark 2,15-22 = Matt 9,10-17 = Luke 5,29-39. In the first *Streitgespräch* narrated by Mark in this section the Pharisees appear at table and bring the complaint that Jesus’ company embraces sinners and tax-collectors, i.e. people unsuited for table fellowship. In the second *Streitgespräch* the issue turns on the fasting of John’s disciples and of the Pharisees – again a commentary on the ideal of table fellowship as the Pharisees understood and practiced it.

3. Mark 2,23-28 = Matt 12,1-8 = Luke 6,1-5. In this *Streitgespräch* the Pharisees fault Jesus for his impiety on the Sabbath. Specifically, the plucking and eating of grain violates both the Sabbath law as well as the laws of tithing⁽³⁹⁾ and ritual purity. In this case, too, the riposte assigned to Jesus comes from the OT in the form of a midrash on 1 Sam 21,1-6.

⁽³⁹⁾ Luke 18,12 also connects tithing (*apodekateuein*) with the Pharisees.

Summarizing his review of the Gospel data, Neusner writes:⁽⁴⁰⁾

What then is to be learned... of the Pharisees? First, they laid great stress on eating with the right people, specifically those who obeyed the purity laws.

Second, they held a "tradition of the elders" about this matter, which required that one wash hands before eating and perform other ritual ablutions. It also required that dishes be purified....

The Pharisees further laid stress on eating the right kinds of food. Some foods may render unclean (defile), and these are not to be eaten. They tithed food with great care and so prepared foods for eating. Tithing was a dietary law, rendering food ritually acceptable....

So apart from the partisan issues (*sic* oral tradition, resurrection, fate, etc.) the central traits of Pharisaism concerned observance of dietary laws.

⁽⁴⁰⁾ NEUSNER, *Politics*, 80. Although it is beyond the scope of this paper to follow Neusner's discussion of the rabbinical traditions about the Pharisees, it should be noted that his careful survey of the relevant materials in Mishnah and Talmud discloses the same interest of the Pharisees in table fellowship, ritual purity and tithing. It is interesting that Paul, the former Pharisee, takes such an interest in the issues of table fellowship (1 Cor 11), dietary laws (Rom 14-15; 1 Cor 8-10), and cleanliness (1 Thess 4,1-12) throughout his letters. Prof. James M. Robinson, who read an early draft of this article, has pointed out that Neusner's reconstruction of the Herodian Pharisees depends heavily on Marcan texts with their portrait of Jesus as a violator of Jewish law who clashes with the Pharisees. Because the Q portrait of Jesus lacks this singular stroke, it is, arguably, unsound to use Mark to reconstruct the life setting for Q. Two points may be noted here. First, the OT material in Q and Q itself may not be as free of legal conflict as has been suggested. On the one hand Luke 4,8 (Deut 6,13); 4,12 (Deut 6,16); 6,27-28 (Lev 19,14.17.18); 10,7 (Lev 19,13b); 11,39-42 (Lev 27,30) are all legal texts whose present contexts in Q (the Temptation story, for example) are ripe with conflict. On the other hand the well known antitheses in Q (Luke 12,58 = Matt 5,25; Luke 6,29-30 = Matt 5,38-42; Luke 6,27-28.32-36 = Matt 5,43-48) make Jesus out to be at least an innovator of the law, if not a direct violator of its contemporary ethical exposition. Second, the western Syrian provenance of both Mark and Q makes it intrinsically possible that they both recognize the historical clash between the Pharisees and Jesus and interpret it from a common point of view. This common point of view mirrors the ongoing tension between Pharisee and Christian in Syria, now augmented by the related clash between conservative (pharisaic?) Jewish Christian and hellenistic Jewish Christian.

7. Conclusion

The first refinement of Robinson's view would be that any description of Q's *Gattung* and *Gattungsgeschichte* allow for the influence of a testimony collection at an early stage. The second refinement proposes that the historical clash between Jewish Christian and Pharisee over table fellowship was inherited by the early Church, and that testimonia assigned to Jesus on the subject of tithing and ritual purity became a valuable resource for the early Church in its own struggle to forge an identity and respond to charges that it no longer respected traditional forms of table fellowship and piety. It is consistent with this view that the only possible reference to Q in the NT (1 Tim 5,18; cf. Luke 10,7 = Matt 10,10) is a reference to one of those OT testimonies gathered around the theme of table fellowship⁽⁴¹⁾. Echos of this historic clash survive in the apocryphal NT, too. Logion 102 of the *Gospel of Thomas* records a Woe directed to the Pharisees: "for they are like a dog sleeping in the manger of oxen, for neither does he eat nor does he let the oxen eat⁽⁴²⁾". Likewise the Acts of John 93 includes a table fellowship scene, in which a Pharisee is featured: "And if ever he were invited by one of the Pharisees and went (where) he was invited, we went with him; and one loaf was laid before each one of us by those who had invited (us)... but he would bless his... and every man was satisfied by that little (piece)..."⁽⁴³⁾.

Dept. of Religious Studies
Southwest Missouri State Univ.
Springfield, Missouri 65804
USA

R. HODGSON

(41) Cf. W. A. MEEKS, *The Writings of St. Paul* (New York 1972) 40 n. 9.

(42) R. CAMERON, *The Other Gospels* (Philadelphia 1982) 36.

(43) CAMERON, *Other Gospels*, 91. Cf. Papyrus Oxyrhynchus 84 in CAMERON, 53. If Cameron's dating of such writings to the first century is correct, then the table fellowship issue has left its mark in a variety of early Christian documents.

SOMMAIRE

Des études récentes de la source Q insistent sur le fait que ce document hypothétique aurait eu une phase de développement pré-synoptique aussi bien qu'une histoire sociale. James M. Robinson a ouvert le débat actuel avec son essai devenu maintenant classique: «LOGOI SOPHON». Cet article propose deux améliorations à ses vues. La première est que l'hypothèse testimoniale (*testimony hypothesis*) pourrait apporter des éléments en faveur de l'incorporation des citations de l'AT dans le document Q. La seconde est que sur la base de quelques unes de ces citations de l'AT, on peut discerner une période de son évolution pendant laquelle la communauté liée à Q a utilisé ces témoignages vétéro-testamentaires dans la controverse avec les Pharisiens à propos des questions de table commune, de paiement de la dîme et de pureté rituelle.

Zur theologischen Deutung des Moabbundes

Dieser Aufsatz will die Frage nach dem richtigen Verständnis des Moabbundes stellen⁽¹⁾.

In Dtn 28,69 lesen wir: "Dies sind die Worte des Bundes, den der Herr dem Mose mit den Israeliten im Lande Moab zu schliessen gebot – *neben* dem Bunde, den er mit ihnen am Horeb schloss"⁽²⁾. Aus dieser Feststellung geht hervor, dass zu Lebzeiten Moses neben dem Sinaibund – in der dtr Literatur stets Horebbund genannt⁽³⁾ – noch ein anderer, eben der Moabbund, geschlossen wurde. Die ausdrückliche Betonung der Besonderheit dieses Bundes (*mill'bad*) lässt nicht zu, ihn nur als eine Art Bestätigung, Erklärung oder Erneuerung des Horebbundes aufzufassen⁽⁴⁾. Es ist eher ein neuer selbständiger Bund!

(1) Es ist erstaunlich, wie wenig darüber in der modernen Bibelwissenschaft reflektiert wurde. Man bemerkt es, wenn man die von H.D. PREUSS, *Deuteronomium* (Erträge der Forschung 164; Darmstadt 1982) 237-239, zusammengestellte Bibliographie konsultiert.

(2) Diesen Vers verstehe ich mit den meisten Exegeten als Anfang der mit Dtn 29 beginnenden neuen Moserede. Siehe den Beweis bei N. LOHFINK, "Der Bundesschluss im Land Moab. Redaktionsgeschichtliches zu Dtn 28,69-32,47", *BZ* 6 (1962) 32-56, bes. 32-34.

(3) Die Gründe, welche die dtr Redaktoren bewogen haben konnten, den Namen "Sinai" durch den Namen "Horeb" zu ersetzen, wurden überzeugend von L. PERLITT, "Sinai und Horeb", *Beiträge zur alttestamentlichen Theologie* (FS. W. Zimmerli; Göttingen 1977) 302-322 dargelegt.

(4) Von Erneuerung sprechen z.B. C.F. KEIL und F. DELITZSCH, zitiert nach: *Pentateuch. Commentary on the Old Testament in Ten Volumes* (Grand Rapids 1980 [reprinted] 446; J. CULLEN, *The Book of the Covenant in Moab* (Glasgow 1903) 26; C. ERDMANN, *The Book of the Deuteronomy* (Los Angeles 1953) 77; C.T. FRANCISCO, *The Book of the Deuteronomy* (Grand Rapids 1964) 101; M.G. KLINE, *Deuteronomy* (The Wycliffe Bible Commentary; London 1969) 195; L. ALONSO SCHÖKEL, *Deuteronomio*, *Pentateuco II* (Los Libros Sagrados; Madrid 1970) 377; P.C. CRAIGIE, *The Book of the Deuteronomy* (NICNT; Grand Rapids 1972) 353. — H. CUNLIFFE-JONES, *Deuteronomy* (TBC; London 1964) 160 spricht von Erklärung;

Die Einführung, die Betonung und die breite literarische Ausgestaltung des Moabbundes kommt von jenen späteren Redaktoren, die zu Dtn 5–28 die Kapitel 29–32 hinzugefügt haben. Das Deuteronomium selbst sieht die Dinge, die sich im Lande Moab abspielen, anders. Hier ist zunächst der Horebbund als das ausschlaggebende Ereignis in den Vordergrund gestellt (Dtn 5). Am Horeb wird der Dekalog als das Grundgesetz dem ganzen Volk Israel geoffenbart. Doch das Volk, vom Glanz der Theophanie beeindruckt, schlägt Mose vor, er allein solle in der Nähe Gottes bleiben, um von ihm die weitere Offenbarung seines Willens zu empfangen (5,25–27). Gott ist damit einverstanden und teilt nur Mose seine *ḥuqqîm wemišpāṭîm* mit. Diese “Bestimmungen” und “Rechtssatzungen” werden eben jetzt, am Ende des Wüstenaufenthalts, im Lande Moab an das ganze Volk weitergegeben. Ob die feierliche Versammlung im Lande Moab schon im Dtn 5–28 den Charakter eines Bundesschlusses hat, ist mindestens zweifelhaft. Dtn 26,16–19, wo wahrscheinlich ein gegenseitiger Austausch der Eidesworte vorliegt⁽⁵⁾, könnte es zwar nahelegen, doch wird dem Moabereignis nirgends das entscheidende Wort *berît* beigelegt. Wenn man also davon als von einem Bund sprechen will, dann eher im Sinne einer Ergänzung des Horebbundes, zumal sich die Einzelgesetze, Dtn 12–26, als Fortsetzung und Auslegung des am Horeb geoffenbarten Dekalogs verstehen (vgl. Dtn 5,22–31). Der Moabbund als ein selbständiger Bund ist erst von jenen Redaktoren eingeführt worden, die, wie oben gesagt, Dtn 29–32 redigiert⁽⁶⁾ und dabei die Kapitel 29–30 als eine Möserede gestaltet

R. CLIFFORD, *Deuteronomy with an Excursus on Covenant and Law* (Old Testament Message 4; Wilmington 1982) 154 von Bestätigung. Viele Autoren lassen die Frage nach dem gegenseitigen Verhältnis von Horeb- und Moabbund unbeantwortet; so z.B. C. Steuernagel, A. Bertholet und G. von Rad in ihren Kommentaren. — Soweit ich sehe, hat nur A. PHILLIPS, *Deuteronomy* (CNEB; Cambridge 1973) 199, dieses Verhältnis ähnlich wie ich aufgefasst, indem er schreibt: “The deuteronomic historians see the Covenant at Moab... as replacing the earlier Covenant at Horeb annulled by the Babylonian conquest”. Ich gehe jedoch einen Schritt weiter.

⁽⁵⁾ Siehe dazu N. LOHFINK, “Dtn 26,17–19 und die Bundesformel”, *ZKT* 91 (1969) 517–553, bes. 527–540.

⁽⁶⁾ Ich folge hier LOHFINK, “Der Bundesschluss”, 32–56, der den ganzen Block Dtn 29–32 als eine unter dem Titel Dtn 28,69 stehende inhaltliche und redaktionelle Einheit versteht. Diese Meinung steht nicht mehr so allein. Angeschlossen haben sich ihr auch S. C. ALDAY, *El cántico de Moisés* (Dt 32)

haben, die während der liturgischen Feier des Bundesschlusses im Lande Moab gehalten wurde.

Warum hat jenen Redaktoren der Horebbund nicht genügt? Wozu noch ein Moabbund? Was ist seine genaue Funktion?

Das oben Gesagte genüge zur Präzisierung der Fragestellung. Bevor ich jedoch weitergehe, müssen manche Voraussetzungen genannt und, wenn nötig, gerechtfertigt werden.

1. Im Hintergrund mancher meiner Überlegungen steht die noch immer vertretbare Theorie, dass das Dt als Ganzes sowie in manchen seiner Einzelteile nach dem Muster der altorientalischen Vasallenverträge konzipiert wurde⁽⁷⁾. Ich nehme diese Theorie in jener Form an, die D.J.McCarthy in der zweiten, neubearbeiteten Auflage seiner Dissertation, "*Treaty and Covenant*", als geltend bewiesen hat⁽⁸⁾. Was die Anwendung seiner Ergebnisse auf Dtn 29–32 betrifft, bin ich der Meinung, dass seine Redaktoren zwar nicht ein striktes Bundesformular herstellen wollten, sehr wohl jedoch über den Moabbund in den jenem Formular eigentümlichen Kategorien spontan nachdachten. Davon kommt es m.E., dass diese Kapitel an vielen Stellen mehrere Themen des Bundesformulars behandeln und fast alle Elemente eines nach ihm gültigen Bundesschlusses beinhalten⁽⁹⁾.

(Madrid 1970) 140-145; C. J. LABUSCHAGNE, "The Song of Moses: Its Framework and Structure", *De fructu oris sui*, Essays in Honour of Adrianus van Selms (POS IX; Leiden 1971) 85-98, bes. 90; und R. CLIFFORD, *Deuteronomy*, 151.

(7) Siehe dazu die klassischen Werke: G. E. MENDENHALL, *Law and Covenant in Israel and the Ancient Near East* (Pittsburgh 1955); K. BALTZER, *Das Bundesformular* (WMANT 4; Neukirchen-Vluyn 1960; 21964).

(8) AnBib 21A; Roma 1978. Während die ersten Verfechter dieser Theorie schon für die Mosezeit die Kenntnis und die Nachahmung der hethitischen Vasallenverträge (etwa in der J und E Darstellung des Sinaibundesschlusses) voraussetzten, sieht McCarthy den Ablauf der Dinge umgekehrt: vor dem Deuteronomium kann man nur von unvollständigen und bruchstückhaften Versuchen einer Anpassung der internationalen diplomatischen Vasallenverträge an den israelitischen Bundesbegriff sprechen. Ein voller und konsequenter Ausdruck der alttestamentlichen Bundestheologie in den Kategorien der profanen Vasallenverträge gelang erst den Verfassern des Deuteronomiums.

(9) Diesen Punkt ausführlicher zu behandeln, ist für den Zweck dieses Aufsatzes nicht nötig. Näheres zum Verhältnis von Dtn 29–32 zum Bundesformular siehe bei: LOHFINK, "Der Bundesschluss", 36-55 und MCCARTHY,

2. Wie schon oben angedeutet, halte ich Dtn 29–32 für diejenigen Kapitel, die zum Thema “*Moabbund*” gehören. Damit will ich jedoch nicht behaupten, dass sie literarkritisch aus einem Gusse sind. Wie auch ihre Redaktionsgeschichte im einzelnen aussehen mag⁽¹⁰⁾, soviel steht für mich fest, dass die an der Entstehungsgeschichte von Dtn 29–32 beteiligten Redaktoren über den Moabbund etwas aussagen wollten. Das ist besonders deutlich im Falle von Dtn 29–30, wo jeder redaktionelle Zuwachs als Fortsetzung der in 29,1 begonnenen Moserede ausgestaltet wurde. Diese Rede aber – es sei noch einmal wiederholt – findet, nach der Auffassung von Dtn 28,69–30,20, während der feierlichen Liturgie des Moabbundesschlusses statt, die *hic et nunc* abläuft⁽¹¹⁾. Doch auch für Dtn 31–32 gilt dasselbe. Denn obwohl in diesem Falle die Redaktionsgeschichte viel komplizierter⁽¹²⁾ und die literarische Struktur von Dtn 31 ganz anders angelegt ist⁽¹³⁾, sind hier viele Motive vorhanden, die das Thema “*Bund*” ausmachen⁽¹⁴⁾. Somit teile ich den Standpunkt von N.Lohfink, der

Treaty and Covenant, 199–205. Die Polemik von L. PERLITT, *Bundestheologie im Alten Testament* (WMANT 36; Neukirchen-Vluyn 1969) 27–30, gegen die Auffassung, dass in Dtn 29–30 das Schema des Bundesformulars zu finden ist, überzeugt mich nicht.

⁽¹⁰⁾ Vgl. den Überblick der Forschungsgeschichte zu den redaktionellen Verhältnissen in diesen vier Kapiteln von Dtn bei PREUSS, *Deuteronomium*, 159–165.

⁽¹¹⁾ Nach PERLITT, *Bundestheologie*, 25, ginge es in Dtn 29 nicht um einen Bundesschluss “im Sinne einer wirklichen Handlung, die Berichtgegenstand des Kap.s wäre”. Der Bund sei schon eine vorgegebene Grösse, deren “Generationen-umspannende Bedeutung vor Augen” zu führen sei. Dieser Aussage kann man schwerlich zustimmen. Es ist schon richtig, dass hier über den Bund nicht in berichtender, unpersönlicher Weise gesprochen wird (wie etwa in Ex 19–24), doch kann man in keinem Fall leugnen, dass die dtr Redaktoren absichtlich den Eindruck erwecken wollten, es handle sich um eine jetzt im Gange befindliche Liturgie des Bundesschlusses. Diese gegenwärtige Liturgie ist aber nicht direkt greifbar, sie spiegelt sich in den Worten Moses wider, der während dieser liturgischen Feier die Predigt hält.

⁽¹²⁾ Vgl. dazu die Übersicht der Meinungen bei PREUSS, *Deuteronomium*, 162–164.

⁽¹³⁾ Sie wurde von LOHFINK, “Der Bundesschluss”, 48–51, entdeckt und beschrieben.

⁽¹⁴⁾ Es sind: 1. die Feststellung, dass das Bundesgesetz niedergeschrieben wurde (V.9); 2. die Verordnung, es regelmässig dem Volk vorzulesen (V.10–13); 3. das Gebot, es neben der Bundeslade zu deponieren und zu bewahren (V.24–26); 4. das Thema der Zeugen (V.16–22.28–30) und das damit verbun-

den Geltungsbereich der Überschrift von Dtn 28,69 bis zu 32,47 ausdehnt⁽¹⁵⁾.

3. Die Redaktoren von Dtn 29–32 rechne ich mit den meisten neueren Autoren⁽¹⁶⁾ der deuteronomistischen Schule zu, und zwar jener Richtung, die auch das Jeremiabuch bearbeitet hat⁽¹⁷⁾. Diese Behauptung lasse ich bewusst im unbestimmten, da sich gerade in der neuesten Zeit Hypothesen mehren, die die dtr Schule selbst in dem DtrG auf immer zahlreichere Redaktionen aufspalten⁽¹⁸⁾, so dass es zur Zeit unmöglich ist, zu sagen, wie viele und welche konkreten Redaktionen hier am Werke sind.

Nun aber zurück zu unserer Frage: Warum neben dem Horeb-bund noch ein Moabbund?

Eine doppelte Antwort ergibt sich zunächst aus der ersten, oben genannten Voraussetzung.

I

Zur Gültigkeit eines Bundes, der als Vasallenvertrag dargestellt wird, gehört auch ein schriftliches Dokument, auf dem unter anderem die Geschichte der gegenseitigen Verhältnisse wie auch die jetzt geltenden Verpflichtungen der beiden Kontrahenten verzeichnet sind.

dene Moselied in Dtn 32; 5. das Problem der Nachfolge Moses (V.1-8.14.23) ausführlicher darüber siehe unten; 6. die Theophanie. Die in den Punkten 1-5 genannten Motive gehören zum Bundesformular (siehe dazu LOHFINK, "Der Bundesschluss", 47,54-55). Das letzte ist zwar vom Bundesformular her nicht erforderlich, ist aber für die echt israelitische Bundesschlussvorstellung typisch (vgl. dazu die Bemerkungen von McCARTHY, *Treaty and Covenant*, 273-276).

⁽¹⁵⁾ Siehe oben A.2 und 6.

⁽¹⁶⁾ Vgl. dazu PREUSS, *Deuteronomium*, 157-163. Siehe auch PERLITT, *Bundestheologie*, 25, A.2, wo die dtr Terminologie von Dtn 29 zusammengestellt ist.

⁽¹⁷⁾ Die ausführliche Behandlung dieser dtr Bearbeitung des Jeremiabuches findet man bei W. THIEL, *Die deuteronomistische Redaktion von Jeremia 1-25* (WMANT 41; Neukirchen-Vluyn 1973); ID., *Die deuteronomistische Redaktion von Jeremia 26-45* (WMANT 52; Neukirchen-Vluyn 1981).

⁽¹⁸⁾ Vgl. z.B. R. SMEND, *Die Entstehung des Alten Testaments* (ThW 1; Stuttgart 1978) 111-124; G. BRAULIK, "Spuren einer Neubearbeitung des deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerks in 1 Kön 8,52-53.59-60", *Bib* 52 (1971) 20-33; N. LOHFINK, "Kerygmata des deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerks", *Die Botschaft und die Boten* (FS. H.W. Wolff [Hrsg. J. Jeremias]; Neukirchen-Vluyn 1981) 87-100.

Das ganze Dtn 5–28 hat nun für die dtr Theologen den Charakter gerade eines solchen Dokumentes. Davon zeugen schon die Namen, die diesem Buch in den dtr Schriften gegeben werden: *sēper tōrat mōšeh*⁽¹⁹⁾ oder *sēper hattōrah*⁽²⁰⁾, oder einfach *sēper (hazzeh)*⁽²¹⁾. Im Bericht von der Bundeserneuerung unter dem König Josia erscheint zweimal der Fachausdruck: *sēper habberit* (“die Bundesurkunde”)⁽²²⁾. Woher erhält Dtn 5–28 diese aussergewöhnliche Rangstellung? Im Rahmen des Horebbundes wurde ja nur der Dekalog zur Würde einer Bundesurkunde erhoben (vgl. Dtn 5). Man brauchte einen weiteren Bund, der noch zu Lebzeiten Moses geschlossen und in dem als das allerheiligste Bundesdokument das ganze Dtn 5–28 zunächst proklamiert und dann niedergeschrieben wurde⁽²³⁾. Zu diesem Zwecke wurden von den Redaktoren der dtr Schule die Kapitel 29–32 geschrieben, in denen die Moabversammlung, wo Mose nach Dtn 5,31 das Volk “die ganze Gesetzesweisung, die Bestimmungen und Rechtssatzungen *lehrte*”, in eine Liturgie des Bundesschlusses verwandelt worden ist. Hier liegt für die DtrG die Quelle der unbestrittenen Autorität und des einzigartigen Ranges der Gesetzgebung, die in Dtn 5–28 enthalten ist.

II

Zur Struktur und Logik der altorientalischen Vasallenverträge gehört auch die Tatsache, dass sie bei der Thronnachfolge eines der Kontrahenten erneuert werden mussten⁽²⁴⁾. Zu der Zeit, in der die Moabversammlung stattfindet, wird nun aber auch für Israel das Problem der Nachfolge Moses dringlich. Das DtrG signalisiert es mehrmals: Dtn 1,37–38; 3,23–28; 31,1–8.14.23. Der Bund zwischen Gott und Israel musste eben in diesem Moment, da Mose noch lebte und sein Nachfolger schon feststand, bestätigt und wiederholt werden. Aus diesem zweiten Grunde musste im Lande Moab ein Bund geschlossen werden.

Diese zwei ersten Antworten können jedoch, wenn man sie näher betrachtet, nicht völlig zufriedenstellen. Man versteht jetzt zwar,

⁽¹⁹⁾ Jos 8,31; 23,6; 2 Kön 14,6.

⁽²⁰⁾ Dtn 28,61; 29,20; 30,10; Jos 8,34; 2 Kön 22,8.11.

⁽²¹⁾ Dtn 28,58; 29,19.26; 31,26; 2 Kön 22,8.13.16; 23,3.24.

⁽²²⁾ 2 Kön 23,2.21.

⁽²³⁾ Einen ausdrücklichen Vermerk über das Niederschreiben der Bundesurkunde findet man in Dtn 31,9.24.

⁽²⁴⁾ Siehe dazu BALTZER, *Das Bundesformular*, 71–90.

warum die dtr Redaktoren die Volksversammlung im Lande Moab als Bundesschluss dargestellt haben, doch sieht man noch nicht, warum sie ihre Sonderstellung und Unabhängigkeit von dem Horebbund in Dtn 28,69 so ausdrücklich betont haben. Um die zwei oben genannten Zwecke zu erreichen, würde es ja genügen, den Bundesschluss in Moab als eine Art Ergänzung, Fortsetzung oder Erneuerung des Horebbundes zu schildern. Die so akzentuierte Selbständigkeit jenes Bundes muss noch einen anderen Grund haben. Kann man diesen Grund irgendwie im Text Dtn 29-32 ausgedrückt finden? Hier erst sind wir beim Kernpunkt unseres Problems.

III

Die dtr Redaktorenschule hat erst im Exil ihr charakteristisches Gepräge bekommen⁽²⁵⁾. Sie schreibt für die Exilgeneration und hat für sie ihr Kerygma entfaltet. Diese Generation lebte aber unter dem Schock der totalen nationalen Niederlage, die sie im Jahre 587 erlitten hatte. Der Verlust des von Gott den Vätern gegebenen Landes und die Zerstörung aller religiösen und staatlichen Institutionen hatte die dramatische Frage aufkommen lassen, ob der alte Sinaibund überhaupt noch Bestand habe (vgl. Jer 14,21)⁽²⁶⁾. Die deuteronomische Bundestheologie mit ihrer Übernahme und Adaptierung der internationalen Vasallenverträge, mit ihrer Alternative von Segnungen oder Flüchen, die vom Gehorsam oder Ungehorsam dem Gotteswillen gegenüber abhängig gemacht wurden, musste zwar nicht⁽²⁷⁾, konnte aber leicht eine negative Antwort nahelegen, und wahrscheinlich hat sie dies bei vielen auch bewirkt. Bald entstand jedoch eine Reaktion auf diesen Glaubenspessimismus. Man versuchte nämlich, die Kontinuität der Heilsgeschichte neu und tiefer zu begründen. Einer dieser Versuche kam bekanntlich von seiten des priesterlichen

⁽²⁵⁾ Diesen Satz habe ich absichtlich so formuliert, um der Möglichkeit Rechnung zu tragen, dass es schon eine josianische Edition des DtrG gegeben haben könnte. Diese schon im 19. Jahrhundert bekannte Auffassung scheint wieder ihre Runde zu machen. Vgl. dazu F. M. CROSS, "The Themes of the Book of Kings and the Structure of the Deuteronomistic History", *Cananite Myth and Hebrew Epic, Essays in the History of the Religion of Israel* (Cambridge [Mass] 1973) 274-289; und die Literaturangaben bei LOHFINK, "Kerygmata", 88, A.10.

⁽²⁶⁾ Siehe dazu THIEL, *Redaktion von Jer 26-45*, 62-63.

⁽²⁷⁾ Siehe dazu die treffenden Bemerkungen von MCCARTHY, *Treaty and Covenant*, 296-298.

Geschichtswerks, das das Fundament des beständigen Waltens Gottes zugunsten Israels im bedingungslosen und einseitigen Abrahambunde (Gen 17) sah⁽²⁸⁾. Eine andere Antwort, die in den Büchern der exilischen Propheten auftaucht (Jer 31,31-34; 32,37-41; Ez 16,60-63; 36,24-28; 37,26; Jes 55,3), war die Verheissung eines "neuen Bundes". Gerade in diesem zweiten Horizont bewegen sich auch jene dtr Redaktoren, die Dtn 29-32 verfasst haben. Ich meine behaupten zu können, dass der dtr Moabbund als eine konkrete und fertige Gestalt eben dieses "neuen Bundes" erfunden und eingeführt wurde. Im folgenden seien einige Beweisgründe dafür angeführt.

1) Als Hintergrund zu der eigentlichen Argumentation muss zunächst das Verhältnis der dtr Literatur zu dem herkömmlichen Sinaibund kurz beschrieben werden.

In den dtr Kreisen scheint mir ein gewisser Vorbehalt nicht nur gegenüber dem Namen "*Sinai*"⁽²⁹⁾, sondern auch gegenüber dem "*Sinai-Bund*" selbst zu bestehen. Allerdings geht die theologische Entwertung jenes Bundes nicht auf einmal vor sich, sondern nimmt mit der Zeit zu; sie ist auch nicht in allen dtr Schichten gleich.

Für die Redaktoren von Dtn 5⁽³⁰⁾ ist der Horebbund noch der einzige, und seine Geltung und Lebenskraft reicht bis in ihre Gegenwart, d.h. bis ins Exil⁽³¹⁾. Die "Bestimmungen und Rechtssatzungen", die im Lande Moab dem Volk bekanntgegeben werden (5,1), waren schon damals von Gott direkt Mose geoffenbart (5,31). Sollte nun Dtn 26,16-19 als ein gegenseitiger Austausch der Eidesworte verstanden⁽³²⁾ und mit Dtn 5 redaktionsgeschichtlich gleichgesetzt wer-

⁽²⁸⁾ Zu diesem Thema vgl. R. KILIAN, "Die Priesterschrift. Hoffnung auf Heimkehr", *Wort und Botschaft*, Eine theologische und kritische Einführung in die Probleme des Alten Testaments (Hrsg. J. Schreiner) (Würzburg 1967) 226-243, bes. 230-232.

⁽³⁰⁾ Dieses Kapitel, früher zum Urbestand von Dtn gerechnet, driftet in der neueren Forschung immer mehr an das Randgebiet zwischen Dtn und Dtr, wenn nicht zum Dtr selbst. Siehe dazu PREUSS, *Deuteronomium*, 99-101. Symptomatisch für diese Änderung ist N. LOHFINK, der in seiner Dissertation (*Das Hauptgebot* [AnBib 20; Roma 1963] 140-166, 290) Dtn 5 als eine literarische Einheit mit Dtn 6 ansieht und beide zum dtn Grundtext rechnet, 18 Jahre später aber ("Kerygmata", 92-93) Dtn 5 seiner DtrL-Schicht ("deuteronomistische Landeroberungserzählung") zuschreibt.

⁽³¹⁾ Siehe Dtn 5,2-3 und dazu den treffenden Kommentar von PERLITT, *Bundestheologie*, 43, A.4.

⁽³²⁾ Vgl. auch A.5.

den⁽³³⁾, dann hätten wir in der Moabszene höchstens eine Vergegenwärtigung des Horebbundes⁽³⁴⁾.

In Dtn 4 geschieht eine bedeutsame Verselbständigung der Moabversammlung. Die jetzt zu verkündenden "Bestimmungen und Rechtssatzungen" (Dtn 12–26) haben keine direkte Verbindung zum Horeb mehr; dort bekommt Mose von Gott nur Auftrag und Ermächtigung, später ein im Lande geltendes Recht zu promulgieren, doch das Gesetz selbst scheint nur in Mose seinen unmittelbaren Urheber zu haben⁽³⁵⁾. Dazu kommt noch eine andere Beobachtung. Die dtr Redaktoren von Dtn 4 beziehen sich zwar sehr umständlich auf den Horebbund (V.9–14), sie erwähnen auch die darin wurzelnde Verpflichtung des Volkes auf die "zehn Worte" (V.13), doch das, was sie am meisten an jenem Geschehen interessiert, ist die Art und Weise der damals geschehenen Gottesoffenbarung⁽³⁶⁾, die das ihnen wichtige Verbot der Gottesbilder begründet⁽³⁷⁾. Doch weiss Dtn 4 auch um die grundsätzliche Untreue des Volkes diesem Verbot gegenüber (V.25), also auch um das Scheitern jenes Bundes; wenn es aber trotzdem über die Fortsetzung der Heilsgeschichte redet (V.29–31), dann leitet es den neuen Anfang nicht mehr von dessen Kraft, sondern von der den Vätern gegebenen Verheissung (V.31a) und auch – was für unseren Zusammenhang wichtig ist – von "allen diesen Worten" (V.30a) her, worunter wohl die jetzt in Moab ergangenen Worte und die durch sie vorausgesagten Ereignisse gemeint sind.

Das DtrG hat dem Horebbund wenig Interesse geschenkt. Dieses Werk beginnt zwar am Horeb (Dtn 1,6), doch mit keinem einzigen Wort wird der dazugehörige Bund in Erinnerung gebracht. Statt dessen wird sogleich die Sünde Israels, die für die dtr Theologen als Typus und Anzeichen aller weiteren Sünden gilt⁽³⁸⁾, breit geschildert

⁽³³⁾ Auch Dtn 26,16–19 wird heute immer öfter der dtr Schule zugeordnet. Siehe PREUSS, *Deuteronomium*, 147–148.

⁽³⁴⁾ Vgl. A.4.

⁽³⁵⁾ Auf diesen Unterschied zwischen Dtn 4 und Dtn 5 hat G. BRAULIK, "Weisheit, Gottesnähe und Gesetz. Zum Kerygma von Deuteronomium 4,5–8", *Studien zum Pentateuch* (FS. W. Kornfeld; [Hrsg. G. Braulik] Wien 1977) 165–195, bes. 169 und 171–172, hingewiesen.

⁽³⁶⁾ "Den Klang der Worte hörtet ihr, eine Gestalt aber konntet ihr nicht sehen, nur eine Stimme" (V.12). Vgl. auch V.15.36.

⁽³⁷⁾ Vgl. V.16–18.23.25.

⁽³⁸⁾ Näheres dazu siehe bei N. LOHFINK, "Darstellungskunst und Theologie in Dtn 1,6–3,29", *Bib* 41 (1960) 105–134, bes. 117–120.

(1,19-46). Und doch kennen die Verfasser der DtrG den Horebbund sehr gut. Es kann nämlich für sie nur dieser Bund in Frage kommen, wenn sie zu seiner näheren Bestimmung in 1 Kön 8,9 hinzufügen, dass er "mit den Söhnen Israels geschlossen wurde, als sie aus Ägypten herauskamen"⁽³⁹⁾. Auch in 1 Kön 19,10.14 kann nur der Horebbund gemeint sein, denn hier lässt der Kontext (Elia pilgert zum Horeb!), keine andere Deutung zu⁽⁴⁰⁾. Weil die dtr Geschichtsschreiber den Moabbund nirgends erwähnen, also wahrscheinlich auch nicht kennen, ist überall, wo sie von dem für die israelitische Geschichte grundlegenden Bund im allgemeinen sprechen (Ri 2,20; 1 Kön 11,11; 2 Kön 17,15.35.38; 18,12)⁽⁴¹⁾, der Horebbund anzunehmen. Das Einzige aber, was sie von ihm zu sagen haben, ist, dass er von den Israeliten gebrochen wurde⁽⁴²⁾. Diese Feststellung kehrt wie ein Refrain immer wieder.

Dtn 29-32 scheint mir auf derselben Linie zu liegen, nur dass hier die theologische Herabsetzung des Horebbundes noch ausdrücklicher geworden ist. Man entnimmt dies zwei Indizien, die zusammen zu erwägen sind: 1. Dtn 29,24 weiss um einen Bund, den "der Gott ihrer Väter mit ihnen schloss, als er sie aus dem Ägypterlande herausführte". Im Lichte des oben Gesagten kann es sich hier nur

⁽³⁹⁾ Um jedes Missverständnis auszuschliessen, hat eine spätere dtr Hand noch den Relativsatz, in dem Horeb erwähnt ist (V.9a), hinzugeschrieben, was dann zur Folge hatte, dass der heutige TM, durch Ausfall von *berît* (in der LXX beibehalten) in Unordnung geraten ist. Siehe dazu M. NOTH, *Könige I* (BKAT 9/1; Neukirchen-Vluyn 1968) 171-172,180.

⁽⁴⁰⁾ Auch hier steckt ein textkritisches Problem. Die LXX lesen in V.10 ἐγκατέλιπον σε, statt *'āz-bû berîteka* des MT; V.14 hat dagegen in der Mehrheit der Codices als Objekt des Satzes τὴν διαθήκην σου. Die meisten Autoren halten am MT fest, doch gibt es Kritiker, die die *lectio varians* der LXX vorziehen und den V.14 dem V.10 angleichen (so z.B. R. KITTEL, *Die Bücher der Könige* [HKAT 1/5; Göttingen 1900] 153 und BJ. R. A. CARLSON, "Élie à Horeb", *VT* 19 (1969) 416-439, analysiert (S.429, A.1) die LXX-Übersetzung der ganzen Perikope und kommt zu dem Ergebnis, dass der TM hier doch ursprünglich ist.

⁽⁴¹⁾ An dieser Stelle ist der Ausdruck *berîto* durch *'et kôl 'ăšer šiwwâh mōšeh* ergänzt. Hier könnte zwar ein Hinweis auf die gesetzgeberische Tätigkeit Moses im Lande Moab vorliegen, doch ergibt sich daraus noch nicht, dass der Verfasser dieser Stelle an einen selbständigen, dort geschlossenen Bund denkt. Er könnte ja die Auffassung von Dtn 5 teilen, nach der es sich dort um eine Vergegenwärtigung und Ergänzung des Horebbundes handle. Siehe oben S.97 und 103-104.

⁽⁴²⁾ Vgl. zu den soeben im Text erwähnten auch folgende dtr Stellen im Jeremiabuch: 11,1-8.10; 22,9.

um den Horebbund handeln. Die temporale Infinitivkonstruktion (*b'hôšî' ô*) wird nicht nur die ungefähre Zeit, in der jener Bund zustande kam, sondern auch seine geschichtliche Basis angeben. Der Horebbund, so sagt auch unser Text, wurde so gründlich von den Israeliten ausser acht gelassen, dass jetzt, in der Gegenwart der dtr Redaktoren, das Land vollständig zerstört und verödet daliegt und seine Bewohner weit von ihm wegdeportiert worden sind. Wenn man in Dtn 29,21-27 darüber liest, denkt man unwillkürlich an die ähnliche Aussage von Dtn 28,58-68⁽⁴³⁾, wo die Heilsgeschichte ganz annulliert wird und zu ihrem Ausgangspunkt zurückkehrt. Der Horebbund gehört also der irreparablen Vergangenheit an und ist mit ihr eine tote Sache! – 2. Die Auszugsgeschichte, die als historische Voraussetzung des Horebbundes in Dtn 29,24 angedeutet wurde, ist viel breiter in 29,2-3 behandelt. Hier wird aber klar und deutlich festgestellt, dass Israel jene Geschichte mit unverständlichem Herzen, mit verschlossenen Augen und Ohren erlebt hat. Wollen die dtr Theologen damit nicht unterstellen, dass der Horebbund von Anfang an unwirksam war und dass es eigentlich gar nicht anders sein konnte?

2) Auf diesem Hintergrund hebt sich der Moabbund klar als etwas Besseres und Wichtigeres vom Horebbund ab.

a) Der geschichtliche Prolog in 29,1-7 wurde sehr sorgsam und auf eine sehr abgewogene Weise fast vollständig mit Hilfe von biblischen Zitaten zusammengestellt⁽⁴⁴⁾. Wie N.Lohfink⁽⁴⁵⁾ gezeigt hat, enden seine zwei ersten Strukturteile mit einem bemerkenswerten zeitlich-räumlichen Koordinatensystem (“bis zu diesem Tage” – V.3b; “zu diesem Ort” – V.6a). Die ganze Heilsgeschichte läuft also geradlinig, ohne den Horebbund auch nur mit einem Wort zu würdigen, auf den Zeitpunkt und auf den Ort hin, an dem der Moabbund geschlossen wird. Deutlicher konnte man nicht zum Ausdruck bringen, dass hier und jetzt etwas Entscheidendes geschehen soll.

⁽⁴³⁾ Die beiden Texte werden wohl zeitlich nicht weit voneinanderliegen. Siehe PREUSS, *Deuteronomium*, 157.

⁽⁴⁴⁾ In keiner Weise kann ich hier PERLITT, *Bundestheologie*, 27, zustimmen, der in 29,1-7 eine grosse Unordnung entdeckt, die “entweder auf die grössere Freiheit der lebendigen Ansprache oder aber auf literarische Kompilation” verweist. Ich kann mich nicht dem Eindruck entziehen, L. Perlitt falle in der literarischen Bewertung dieser Verse seinem Vorurteil zum Opfer, in Dtn 29-30 dürfe in keiner Hinsicht ein Bundesformularschema vorliegen.

⁽⁴⁵⁾ “Der Bundesschluss”, 37-38.

b) Die historische Basis dieses zweiten Bundes ist umfangreicher geworden. Die in der Wüste erlebten Ereignisse (offensichtlich eine Darstellung des Exils) und die Landnahme am östlichen Jordanufer (m.E. der Inbegriff der ganzen bisherigen Geschichte, die hier nur als Auftakt zu dem Wesentlichen, das eben jetzt kommen soll, aufgefasst wird) sind inzwischen hinzugekommen. Von jenen Ereignissen wird nicht mehr gesagt, sie würden mit verschlossenen Augen und unverständlichem Herzen erlebt, im Gegenteil, diese Geschichte wird als eine fortdauernde Katechese aufgefasst, die immer noch fähig ist, das Volk in eine tiefere Kenntnis des noch nicht zerstörten besonderen Verhältnisses Gottes zu Israel einzuführen (V.5). Die geistige Haltung des Volkes ist also nicht mehr dieselbe wie während der Auszugsgeschichte, die die existentielle Voraussetzung des Horebbundes war.

c) Das Gesetz, das dem Volke im Moabbund gegeben worden ist, ist nicht nur der Dekalog (wie im Horebbund), sondern auch seine breite Ausführung und Erweiterung, die in Dtn 12–26 enthalten ist und von der es in Dtn 4,8 heisst, dass kein Volk “solch vollkommene Bestimmungen und Rechtssatzungen hat wie dieses ganze Gesetz, das ich euch heute vorlege”⁽⁴⁶⁾. Anders ausgedrückt: das Moabgesetz ist das beste auf der Welt. In ihm kann Israel auch auf eine unübertreffbare Weise die Nähe seines Gottes erfahren⁽⁴⁷⁾. Ausserdem hat Mose am Tag des Bundesschlusses eine katechetische Arbeit ohnegleichen geleistet, um Israel sein neues Bundesgesetz “in den Mund und in das Herz” zu legen (30,14).

d) Der Moabbund wird in Dtn 29–32 als ein wahrer Antriebsmotor der ganzen Heilsgeschichte aufgefasst. Die Segnungen und die Flüche sind nicht mehr als reine Möglichkeiten gemeint, sie sind historisiert. So werden sie zu einer prophetischen Voraussage der ganzen weiteren Heilsgeschichte. Aus diesem Grunde ist auch ihre Reihenfolge umgekehrt: zuerst kommen die Flüche, die sich im Exil schon verwirklicht haben (29,21–27), dann die Segnungen, deren Einlösung noch aussteht und die deswegen als Heilsverheissungen gelten (30,1–10)⁽⁴⁸⁾. So kann Israel in ihrem Lichte seine Gegenwart verste-

⁽⁴⁶⁾ Dtn 4 kann hier m.E. zur Verstärkung der Argumentation herangezogen werden, weil dieses Kapitel, obwohl von einer anderen dtr Redaktion herkommend, älter ist als Dtn 29–30 und ihm phraseologisch und geistig sehr nahekommt.

⁽⁴⁷⁾ Vgl. dazu BRAULIK, “Weisheit”, 184.

⁽⁴⁸⁾ Von einer prophetischen Prägung dieses Abschnittes sprechen viele Autoren. Vgl. z.B. P. BUIS, *Le Deutéronome* (VS AT 4; Paris 1969) 394–395;

hen und richtig deuten (so wie es 29,23-27 geschieht), aber auch voll Hoffnung eine weitere und glücklichere Zukunft erwarten. Auch der Moabbund kann gebrochen werden, doch das wird ihn nicht ungültig und unwirksam machen. Der Abfall Israels zu anderen Göttern ist ja in seiner Logik vorausgesehen (31,16-21.29), die "böse Neigung", die im Herzen des Volkes waltet und es immer wieder in die Sünde treibt, ist aufgedeckt und in Kauf genommen (31,21). Der Moabbund wird Israel immer wieder von neuem zur Umkehr rufen und diese Umkehr in den "künftigen Tagen" (*b'eḥārīt hajjāmîm*) auch herbeiführen (4,30; 30,1-2.6).

e) Damit jedoch die Bekehrung Israels dauerhaft bleibe, wurde in die Segnungsreihe des Moabbundes die Verheissung der Beschneidung des Herzens als einer Heilstat, die Gott selbst vollzieht, aufgenommen (30,6). Nur auf diese Weise wird das Volk befähigt, das Gebot Gottes als ein nahes, in den Mund gelegtes und ins Herz geschriebenes Wort zu erfahren und so den Willen Gottes ständig zu tun (30,14).

f) Mit dieser letzten Beobachtung sind wir bei dem für unseren Zusammenhang wichtigsten Argument angelangt: die Ähnlichkeit des in Dtn 29-32 geschlossenen Bundes mit der exilischen Voraussage eines "neuen Bundes".

Daß die prophetischen Texte, die darüber sprechen, mit Dtn 30,1-10 nahe verwandt sind, wird fast allgemein anerkannt⁽⁴⁹⁾. Drei Elemente sind allen jenen Texten gemeinsam: 1. Die Verheissung einer grundsätzlichen inneren Veränderung des Menschen. Das ezechielsche "neue Herz" und der "neue Geist" (Ez 11,19; 36,26), die jeremianische Zusage einer neuen Gotteskenntnis (Jer 31,34) oder einer neuen, von Gott selbst eingegebenen Gottesfurcht (Jer 32,40) sind inhaltlich mit der dtr Beschneidung des Herzens (Dtn 30,6) identisch. 2. Die Lokalisierung jenes inneren Wirkens Gottes in eine Zeit, in der Er das zerstreute Volk Israel aus allen Teilen der Erde sammeln und wieder in das gelobte Land heimbringen wird (vgl. Dtn

G. VON RAD, *Das fünfte Buch Mose. Deuteronomium* (ATD 8; Göttingen 1978) 131; A. PENNA, *Deuteronomio* (La Sacra Bibbia; Torino 1976) 240.

⁽⁴⁹⁾ Siehe ausser den in A.48 angeführten Kommentaren: A. BERTHOLET, *Deuteronomium* (KHC 5; Tübingen 1899) 91; C. STEUERNAGEL, *Deuteronomium und Josua* (HKAT 1/3; Göttingen 1900) 109; S. R. DRIVER, *Deuteronomy* (ICC; Edinburgh 1902) 330; CLIFFORD, *Deuteronomy*, 157; A. D. H. MAYES, *Deuteronomy*, (NCeB; London 1981) 369. Am klarsten spricht hier von dem "neuen Bund" BUIS, *Le Deutéronome*, 394.

30,3-5 mit Jer 32,37; Ez 11,17; 36,24.28). 3. Die Begleitung dieser zwei grössten Wohltaten mit allerlei Segnungen, die das menschliche Leben in jeder Hinsicht glücklich machen werden (vgl. Dtn 30,7-10 mit Jer 31,38-40; 32,41; Ez 36,29-35).

Doch auch zwischen Dtn 29 und dem prophetischen "neuen Bund" gibt es Gemeinsames. Um das zu zeigen, möchte ich den Weg weiter gehen, den P. Buis⁽⁵⁰⁾ eingeschlagen hat. Auf Grund der Analyse aller alttestamentlichen Texte, die von der Wirklichkeit eines "neuen Bundes" sprechen, glaubt er ein festes stereotypes literarisches Schema gefunden zu haben, in dem man von jener Sache zu reden und zu schreiben pflegte⁽⁵¹⁾. Es besteht aus fünf Elementen, von denen drei sich mit den oben genannten Punkten decken, die zwei anderen aber in Dtn 30,1-10 fehlen. Es sind: 1. die Bundesformel, die den Bund definiert, und 2. eine Klausel, die besagt, dass der Bund "neu" oder "ewig", d.h. definitiv sein wird. Es stimmt, dass die zwei letzten Bestandteile des von P. Buis eruierten literarischen Schemas in Dtn 30 fehlen, doch sind sie in Dtn 29 vorhanden. Was die Bundesformel betrifft, begegnet sie uns ausdrücklich in 29,12. Nebenbei sei hier vermerkt, dass das besondere, schon früher von Gott verheissene (V.12ayb)⁽⁵²⁾ Gottesverhältnis, das diese Formel ausdrückt, erst jetzt im Moabbund (und nicht im Horebbund) Wirklichkeit wird. Die Charakterisierung des künftigen Bundes als "neu" oder "ewig" ist dagegen in Dtn 29 nur implizit ausgesagt⁽⁵³⁾. Ich sehe sie nämlich in V.13-14 enthalten, wo festgestellt wird, dass der Moabbund auch für diejenigen verpflichtend sein soll, "die heute hier mit uns nicht zugegen sind". Die Formulierung besagt: er erstreckt sich auf alle künftigen Generationen. Seine ewige Gültigkeit und Unwiderruflichkeit von seiten Gottes geht dagegen aus all jenen Stellen hervor, die ihn als den echten Mittelpunkt der Heilsgeschichte herausstellen, in dem schon alles Künftige – der Abfall, das Exil und der Neuanfang – enthalten und vorprogrammiert ist⁽⁵⁴⁾.

3) Alle oben angeführten Überlegungen, besonders aber die in

⁽⁵⁰⁾ "La Nouvelle Alliance", VT 18 (1968) 1-15.

⁽⁵¹⁾ BUIS, "La Nouvelle Alliance", 1-2.

⁽⁵²⁾ Vgl. Näheres dazu bei D. E. SKWERES, *Die Rückverweise im Buch Deuteronomium* (AnBib 79; Roma 1979) 129-137 und 178-180.

⁽⁵³⁾ Dieses Element ist aber auch in anderen prophetischen Texten, die vom "neuen Bund" sprechen, oft nicht vorhanden. Vgl. BUIS, "La Nouvelle Alliance", 5-6.

⁽⁵⁴⁾ Siehe dazu oben S. 107-108.

den beiden letzten Punkten signalisierte Ähnlichkeit mancher Aussagen von Dtn 30,1-14 mit dem exilischen Begriff eines "neuen Bundes", machen deutlich, dass der Moabbund mit eben diesem "neuen Bund" etwas zu tun hat. Ich möchte den Zusammenhang dieser zwei Bünde in der Begrifflichkeit einer typologischen Exegese folgenderweise ausdrücken: Der Moabbund ist ein von den dtr Redaktoren von Dtn 29-32 eingeführtes Theologumenon, das den exilischen "neuen Bund" präfigurieren soll. Man müßte hier den Begriff "biblische Figur" oder "Typus" gebrauchen, wenn man sich mit den dtr Theologen in die fingierte Optik der Mosezeit versetzt. Denn ohne diese Optik könnte man einfach sagen, dass der Moabbund eine konkrete Darstellung des "neuen Bundes", seine Vorwegnahme ist. Das für den "neuen Bund" typische Gesetz, das von Gott in das Innere des Menschen gelegt und ins Herz hineingeschrieben werden wird (Jer 31,33), das man endlich, vom Geist Gottes angespornt, beobachten wird (Ez 36,27), ist also ganz konkret Dtn 5-28⁽⁵⁵⁾.

Die Lokalisierung dieses "neuen Bundes" in die entlegene Mosezeit ist bestimmt auch eine Antwort auf die von den exilischen Reformatoren diskutierte Frage, wie denn das Verhältnis eines "neuen Bundes" zu Mose sei: kann man überhaupt von irgendeinem Bund sprechen, der keinen Bezug zu Mose hätte? Die dtr Verfasser von Dtn 29-32 würden dann durch die Erfindung des Moabbundes auch auf die mosaischen Wurzeln des "neuen Bundes" hinweisen wollen.

Zum Abschluss sei noch eine Erwägung angefügt, die vielleicht das ganze Problem vereinfacht. Es wird immer mehr zur *opinio communis*, dass die jeremianischen Texte, die vom "neuen Bund" sprechen, nicht vom Propheten selbst verfaßt wurden, sondern auf eine spätere dtr Bearbeitung seiner Schriften zurückgehen⁽⁵⁶⁾. In den letzten zwanzig Jahren mehren sich ferner die Stimmen derer, die auch im Ezechielbuch eine dtr Redaktorenhand vermuten, und zwar vor allem in jenen Textbereichen, die sich auf die Wirklichkeit eines

⁽⁵⁵⁾ Vgl. Jer 31,33 und Ez 36,27 mit Dtn 30,11-14.

⁽⁵⁶⁾ Vgl. darüber THIEL, *Redaktion von Jer 26-45*, 23-28 (auf S.24, A.12-14 findet man eine breitere Bibliographie zum Thema); N. LOHFINK, "Der junge Jeremia als Propagandist und Poet", *Le Livre de Jérémie* (BETHL LIV; Leuven 1981) 351-368, bes. 352, A.6; ID., "Die Gotteswortverschachtelung in Jer 30-31", *Künder des Wortes*, Beiträge zur Theologie der Propheten (FS. J. Schreiner; Würzburg 1982) 105-119.

neuen Bundes beziehen⁽⁵⁷⁾. Somit strebt alles der Schlussfolgerung zu, dass der Gedanke eines "neuen Bundes" in den dtr Kreisen geboren und ausgestaltet wurde⁽⁵⁸⁾. Man könnte ihn als ein Spezifikum, wenn nicht der ganzen, so doch wenigstens eines Zweiges dieser theologischen Schule bezeichnen. Was Wunder also, dass einige ihrer Repräsentanten auf die Idee kamen, jenen Bund in die Mosezeit zurückzuprojizieren und ihn als eine schon fertige, konkrete, lebendige und kraftvolle Realität ihren verzweifelten Glaubensbrüdern vor Augen zu stellen!

ul. Rakowiecka 61
02-532 Warszawa
Polen

A. CHOLEWINSKI

SOMMAIRE

Dans le cadre de la théologie de l'AT, la fonction et la place de l'alliance au Pays de Moab (Dt 28,69) a été peu ou insuffisamment traitée par l'exégèse contemporaine. Cette fiction du Dtr est la plupart du temps considérée comme un supplément de l'alliance du Sinaï, et on la dit insérée dans l'histoire Dtr pour donner au système législatif Dt 12-26 la haute autorité d'un document d'alliance. Il semble que cette interprétation ne reflète qu'une partie de la vérité. Une analyse des déclarations de Dt 29-32 montre en effet que l'alliance en Moab a une signification plus grande que l'alliance au Sinaï, qui est ainsi repoussée dans l'ombre. Il y a beaucoup de raisons pour dire que l'alliance en Moab doit être une présentation concrète de la «nouvelle alliance» des prophètes ou, si l'on se met dans l'optique du temps de Moïse — optique prise par le rédacteur Dtr —, sa «préfiguration».

⁽⁵⁷⁾ Vgl. z.B. S. HERRMANN, *Die prophetischen Heilserwartungen im Alten Testament* (BWANT 5; Stuttgart 1965) 247 und 283; F. HOSSFELD, *Untersuchungen zu Komposition und Theologie des Ezechielbuches* (FzB 20; Würzburg 1977) 322-336, zusammenfassend: 526.

⁽⁵⁸⁾ Mit dieser Behauptung leugne ich selbstverständlich nicht jeden jeremianischen Anteil an der Entstehung dieses Gedankens. Wie LOHFINK, "Der junge Jeremia", 365-366, schreibt, kommt die Weissagung einer qualitativ neuen Intervention Gottes in der Heilsgeschichte bestimmt von Jeremia selbst (Lohfink weist dabei auf Jer 31,22 hin), nur wäre die konkrete Darstellung jenes künftigen Geschehens in der Begrifflichkeit eines "neuen Bundes" deuteronomistisch.

‘Jedidiah’ and Cognate Forms as a Title of Royal Legitimation

In an earlier discussion of some of the ideological issues involved in royal succession in Jerusalem, I took up the suggestion of E. Hammershaimb and J. Lindblom that the ‘*immānû*’ēl of Isa 7,14 is none other than Hezekiah, the mysterious ‘*almāh*’ whose pregnancy gives rise to the oracle being Ahaz’ (chief) queen Abijah⁽¹⁾. I also suggested that Nathan’s oracle in 2 Sam 12,24f., which announces that Yahweh loves Solomon, and results in him receiving the cognomen Jedidiah, is to be construed as an oracular affirmation of Solomon’s status as heir, thus confirming the succession⁽²⁾. It seems to me that these two episodes share a common structure, in which a time of national crisis is brought to a happy outcome by the birth of an heir, and by the giving to him of a special title which signifies the divine choice, thus obviating the kind of dynastic squabbling which might otherwise ensue in polygamous court circles.

If this interpretation is correct, and may be taken as evidence of established procedure in the court of Jerusalem, it is surprising that we find no other examples of royal cognomens in use in ancient Judah. Perhaps the establishment of a principle of primogeniture made this a redundancy in most circumstances⁽³⁾. In this case, we

(¹) E. HAMMERSHAIMB, “The Immanuel sign”, *StTh* 3 (1949) 124-142; J. LINDBLOM, *A study of the Immanuel section in Isaiah, Isa. vii, 1 – ix, 9* (Lund 1958) 24; see N. WYATT, “‘Araunah the Jebusite’ and the throne of David”, *StTh* 38 (1984) in press.

(²) Cf. G. W. AHLSTRÖM, “Solomon, the chosen one”, *HR* 8 (1968-9) 102.

(³) See T. ISHIDA, *The royal dynasties in ancient Israel* (BZAW 142; Berlin-New York 1977) 152. He cites 1 Kgs 2,15.22; 2 Chr 21,3. As Solomon’s example suggests however, what was more important was the status of one’s mother, the monarchy being initially at least polygamous. I discuss aspects of this in the article cited above.

should explain the oddity of the reintroduction of an archaic practice (and as we shall see, of an atypical formula) in the instance of *'im-mānûēl* as a response to a crisis which threatened the independence of the state, and so required a signal indication of Yahweh's will and purpose in regard to it. In the case of Solomon's succession, primogeniture was certainly not the established practice, and so the oracle indicated the divine choice from the various possible candidates. But if the use of a cognomen in the case of Solomon was in accordance with a convention, we might expect to find precedents for it. Just such a precedent may exist in the case of David. Throughout the historical accounts of David's^(3a) reign, the term *dāwīd* is used as though it is a straightforward personal name. But there are reasons for being suspicious as to the originality of this usage. Firstly there is the curious note in 2 Sam 21,19 to the effect that an Elhanan son of Jair (Heb. *yā'rē*) killed Goliath, paralleled by the account in 1 Chr 20,5 which speaks of Elhanan son of Jair (Heb. *yā'ôr*: K, *y'yr*: Q) killing Goliath's brother, apparently in an attempt to mention the figure of 2 Sam 21,19, while reconciling that tradition with the account in 1 Sam 17 of David's killing of Goliath. In both passages Elhanan's father hails from Bethlehem, and it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that the two consonantal forms are scribal alterations during the history of the transmission of the text in square script of an original *ysy*, being David's father Jesse (יֵשׁוּעַ < יֵשׁוּעַ; the Q form יֵעִיר also fits into such a pattern) also from Bethlehem. Now while in 2 Sam 23,24 (= 1 Chr 11,26) Elhanan is said to be the son of Dodo (*bn dḏw*), we may reasonably suppose a further textual difficulty, and see here a garbled version of what is implied in the passages just cited, that Elhanan and David were in fact one and the

(3a) At first glance the discussion of A. M. HONEYMAN, "The evidence for regnal names among the Hebrews", *JBL* 67 (1948) 13-25, may appear to disprove my argument. However, he is discussing two issues, alteration of names (*Namenänderung*) and alternation of names (*Namenwechsel*) which are distinct not only from one another, but also from the category I am here discussing. The force of my argument is unaltered by the fact that Honeyman treats the equations David = Elhanan and Jedidiah = Solomon as examples of *Namenwechsel*, wrongly in my view, since he then fails to recognise the ideological significance of the first half of each equation. I do not dispute the value of Honeyman's discussion of genuine instances of the two phenomena with which he is concerned.

same person⁽⁴⁾. Secondly, apart from this elusive Dodo, whose name is suspiciously like a metathetical version of David, (*dwd* > *ddw*), the term *dāwīd* is a *hapax* in the Bible as a personal name⁽⁵⁾. This does not in itself constitute a forcible argument against a meaning as a personal name, but is worthy of note. Thirdly, the vocalisation of the name in its conventional form gives a totally opaque term, for which it is hard to find a convincing Hebrew explanation⁽⁶⁾.

There is a possible line of enquiry, however, which promises to be more fruitful. The name (or title) has been linked with *dwd*, having the sense of 'love'⁽⁷⁾. Before we consider this, let us deal further with the form *yāḏīd*, cons. *yḏīd*, coming from the associated root *ydd* (< *wdd*). As well as its use in the form Jedidiah, it occurs in a number of other contexts. We may note in the passage cited above, 2 Sam 12,24f., that the name given to Solomon does not correspond to the verb used in the statement that 'Yahweh loved him' ('*hb*), as we might expect, but instead appears to substitute for what was presumably the common term another which, from its usage

(4) Cf. L. M. VON PÁKODZY, "Elhanan - der frühere Name Davids?", *ZAW* 68 (1956) 257-259. On the textual problem at 2 Sam 21,19 cf. also S. R. DRIVER, *Notes on the Hebrew text and topography of the books of Samuel* (Oxford 1913) 354f.; H. W. HERTZBERG, *Die Samuelbücher* (Göttingen 1956) 313f.; ID. *I and II Samuel* (London 1964) 385; D. BARTHÉLEMY, *Critique textuelle I* (Fribourg-Göttingen 1982) 303. Cf. also HONEYMAN, "The evidence", 24.

(5) The *bn* may be thought to be an insuperable problem in the formula 'Elhanan ben Dōdō. But if we think of the similarity of *b* and initial and medial *k* in the square script, we may perhaps propose an earlier *kn*, which can be construed in at least two possible ways (both rare, and thus giving rise to a facilitating gloss - we apply the rule *potius lectio difficilior*): i) *kēn*: adverb with temporal sense 'then', as in 1 Sam 9,13 (*BDB* 486a) - 'Elhanan, then [that is, who later became] David (> Dodo)'; ii) as an abbreviated or damaged form from *kānāh* (*BDB* 487ab, cf. *UT* § 1267) meaning 'betitled' - "Elhanan, given the title 'David'". There are further possibilities along these lines.

(6) The idea that it was derived from Akkadian *dawidum*, supposedly with the sense of 'military commander' is disproved by H. TADMOR, who shows it to mean 'defeat': "Historical implications of the correct rendering of Akkadian *kāku*", *JNES* 17 (1958) 130.

(7) *BDB* 187b. On the ideological significance of *dwd* and *ydd* cf. also G. W. AHLSTRÖM, "Solomon", 102; ID., "Der Prophet Nathan und der Tempelbau", *VT* 11 (1961) 122f.

elsewhere in the Old Testament, appears to be fairly restricted. Its other occurrences are as follows: Ps 60,7 (EVV 5) = 108,7 (EVV 6), where it is plural, which is construed by M. Dahood as a plural of majesty, referring to the king⁽⁸⁾; Ps 127,2, plural in the versions, but singular in Hebrew, again most reasonably construed of the king, in a psalm attributed/applied to Solomon(!); Jer 11,15, feminine in the versions, but masculine in Hebrew, and again referring in all probability to the king; Deut 33,12, where it might at first glance appear to be inconsistent with the otherwise royal connection we have noted, in that it refers to Benjamin: but if we recall that Saul came from the tribe of Benjamin, then this verse provides the sole example of the usage in the possible context of the monarchy of Israel.

The occurrence of *yēdīdī* in Isa 5,1 brings us back to the matter of *dwd*, because the two forms appear in parallel:

<i>'āšīrāh nā' līdīdī</i>	Let me sing concerning my beloved,
<i>šīrat dōdī l'karmō</i>	a song of my loved one concerning
	his vineyard:
<i>kerem hāyāh līdīdī</i>	my beloved had a vineyard...

I shall enlarge below on my translation of the *l* in the first two instances here. The important question concerns the identity of the singer and of the person sung about. The beloved cannot seriously be identified with Yahweh, because not only is such a usage unparalleled, but it is also in conflict with the usage we have so far noted, and further, leaves unresolved the identity of the singer. To say that it is Isaiah himself is rather lame⁽⁹⁾. The singer I take to be Yahweh himself, who is clearly the speaker in the application of the parable to Jerusalem in v. 3. The person sung about, the beloved or loved one, can surely only seriously be identified with the king in Jerusalem. The idea of the king as a cultivator is no cause for surprise, because this is precisely the role played by the Primal Man in Eden, according to Gen 2,15, whom we know to be primarily a paradigm of royalty, drawing on an ancient and widespread motif⁽¹⁰⁾. In all passages dealt with thus far, then, we have found

⁽⁸⁾ M. J. DAHOOD, *Psalms II* (AB 17; Garden City 1973²) 76, 79.

⁽⁹⁾ O. KAISER, *Isaiah 1-12* (London 1972) 59f.

⁽¹⁰⁾ See my note "Interpreting the creation and fall story in Genesis 2-3", *ZAW* 93 (1981) 14f.; cf. G. WIDENGREN, "The king and the tree of life in ancient Near Eastern religion", *UUÅ* 1951, 4, 15ff.

the *yādīd* to refer to the king, at any rate in all probability. We may in parenthesis note two further passages of some relevance. Jer 12,7 mentions *yēdidūt napšī*, 'the beloved of my soul' or more prosaically simply 'my beloved' (cf. RSV), where *yēdidūt* is strictly a feminine abstract noun, although in view of its use in an apostrophe concerning Jerusalem as the bride of Yahweh, it may be preferable to read instead *yēdidôt*, construed as a feminine singular in *-ôt* (< *-āt*), and recognise here an ideological equivalent of the (chief) queen (*gebīrah*); indeed, Josiah's mother was named Jedidah (*yēdidah*) according to 2 Kgs 22,1, the later Hebrew form of the term just proposed, and very significantly the exact feminine counterpart to *yādīd* as a title of the king.

In Isa 5,1 *yādīd* is paralleled by the term *dôd*, the two being clearly equivalent not only in meaning, but also in their common reference to the king. It would not be altogether implausible to propose that the form *dôdī* (*dwydī*) is itself a metathesis for *dāwīd* (*dwyd*), the *plene* form of the name David, since he may by his capture of Jerusalem and establishment of the dual empire be said poetically to have planted a vineyard. But there is no need for conjecture of this sort, because a parallel to this term occurs in the Song of Songs, where the king of 1,4, who is surely not Yahweh but the king of Judah who performs the *hieros gamos*, is called *dôdī*, my beloved, consistently by the bride. The existence of two effectively synonymous terms for the king, *dôd* and *yādīd*, need occasion no surprise, since they might, for instance, be explained in terms of dialectal forms, though it is not possible to determine which is which, or equally well as liturgical variants. As regards their possible relation to the name David, it is perhaps significant that this in its *plene* form consists of the consonantal structure of the former with the vocalisation of the latter, and so may represent a hybrid form which was in particular vogue during his day.

My translation above of the *l* as 'concerning' may be felt by some to require justification. But apart from recognition of such a sense, particularly in connection with verbs of speaking and associated ideas, by *BDB*⁽¹¹⁾, we have the same usage in the Ugaritic

⁽¹¹⁾ *BDB* § 5e, 514a. Cf. also M. H. POPE, *Song of songs* (AB 7c; Garden City 1977) 295f.

texts, as in the formulae *lb'l* (KTU 1. 6 i l [UT 62:1]), *l krt* (l. 14 i 1,16 i l [UT Krt:1, 126:1]) and *l aqht* (l. 19 i l [UT 1 Aqht:1]), where we may translate 'concerning...' whoever is the chief character in the ensuing narrative. It is very likely that we should also translate the formula *ldwd* in the Psalms in similar fashion, seeing in it an allusion not specifically to David, but to the king (every king) as the chief ideological personage concerned in the psalm: that is, as a designation of 'royal psalms'. It is no weakness in this argument that certain undoubtedly royal psalms (e.g. 2) do not have it, or that some have other ascriptions (e.g. 74). Presumably all or most of the ascriptions are in any case later than the accompanying psalm, and once the expression *ldwd* had come to be understood to refer to David, the tendency would tend to be to find other historical allusions and characters in the material. In any case, David was effectively the archetypal king, and if the expression *dāwīd* came to be understood as an allusion specifically to him, there was certainly no loss in the broad ideological significance of the 'Davidic' psalms.

Our discussion so far has raised the possibility, in my view a probability, that divine choice of kings of Judah was indicated by the giving to them of a cognomen, which tended to be the same one. Even if it were a mere formality and had little usage outside liturgical expressions such as the psalms or the Song of Songs, the narrative in 2 Sam 12,24f. suggests that the choice of Solomon for the succession in Jerusalem is presented as a paradigm for all later successions, being in effect a stereotyped equivalent of the descriptions of the divine choice of Saul and David. If we are to think of a pattern, the question naturally arises as to whether we can discern any likely antecedents to it.

We shall turn below to the Ugaritic evidence, where the formula *mdd il*, with the variation *ydd il* (of the same formal structure as Jedidiah) is used of the deities Yam and Mot. For a number of reasons, we should not look here for a direct source of the Judahite usage. But if we look in the opposite direction, to Egypt, we find that royal protocol has formulae which correspond exactly to the biblical usage, particularly in its extended form *yddid-DN*, as in Jedidiah.

There is no need to give a complete list of instances in Egypt, but a perusal of king-lists is instructive. There are many problems regarding the reconstruction of complete dynastic lists, and the full five-fold titulary is more commonly missing than established for

those kings known⁽¹²⁾. But from surviving material the following pattern emerges. Numbers cited are those in von Beckerath's list. The key element is the term *mr* (*mri*, *mry*), either in the form *mr-DN* or *mr-n-DN* ('beloved-of-DN'). In Old Kingdom examples it appears to be a genuine personal name construction, since it constitutes the whole name found in cartouches, as in *mr-n-R'* – Mer-en-Ra' = Menthesuphis (§ 6.4). It is however clearly ideological in significance, and in early examples normally appears in the *nsw-bit* name (prenomen) which was part of the protocol given at the king's accession. In Old and Middle Kingdom and Intermediate Periods usage extended formulae involving the element *mr-* also occur, as in § 13 suppl. j: *mr-'nh-R'* – Mer-ankh-Ra' (Mentuhotpe). None of the examples from before the New Kingdom, with the exception of § 6.6, use the formula in conjunction with another name in the same cartouche. Neither is there any example of the formula occurring before then as part of the *s3 R'* name (nomen), which according to Gardiner was the king's own personal name. While this is not invariable, from the time of Haremhab (§ 18.14) its incorporation with the *s3 R'* name is normative. By far the commonest form from New Kingdom and later times is *mr-'Imn* – Mer-Amun – clearly reflecting the theological and political interests of Thebes, though *mr-n-Pth* – Mer-en-Ptah – occurs in §§ 19.2, 4, 5, 7 and recurs from the time of Ptolemy V, and the later Ptolemies and the Romans either added Isis (*mr-Pth-3st*) or had her name by itself, evidently reflecting the importance of Memphis, and indeed possibly reflecting profound changes in the theological climate.

The incorporation of the *mr-DN* formula into the *s3 R'* cartouche may have simply become a monumental convention, but it is perhaps interesting to note that in the case of Haremhab, the first

(12) For lists of kings with cartouches, see H. GAUTHIER, *Le livre des rois d'Égypte* (MIFAO 17-20, four vols., Cairo 1907-1916); E. A. W. BUDGE, *Egyptian dictionary* (London 1920) II, 917-946. For more up to date assessment and analysis of the ancient lists see A. H. GARDINER, *Egypt of the Pharaohs* (Oxford 1961) appendix; see also J. VON BECKERATH, *Abriss der Geschichte des alten Ägypten* (Munich-Vienna 1971); ID., *Lexikon der Ägyptologie* III, 542-556 (Wiesbaden 1980); E. HORNUNG-E. STAHLIN, *Skarabäen und andere Siegelamulette aus Basler Sammlungen* (*Ägyptische Denkmäler in der Schweiz* I; Mainz 1976). For the construction and significance of the fivefold titulary see A. H. GARDINER, *Egyptian grammar* (London-Oxford 1957³) *excursus* A, 71-76; VON BECKERATH, *Lexikon* III, 540-542.

king of whom it is attested, we have a classic instance of usurpation of the throne, with extraordinary efforts on the part of the king to assert his legitimacy, which may be read between the lines of his inscription⁽¹³⁾. Whatever significance be attached to the change in the place of the formula within the titulary, what had hitherto been a somewhat haphazard usage now became a routine part of it, and if we are right in seeing Haremhab's use as the precedent, it is to be seen as a legitimization claim, particularly appropriate in the case of foreign dynasts in the later period⁽¹⁴⁾. In its general usage, it may have come to be used as the conventional way of designating who of the often multitudinous princes of the blood was to be regarded as heir to the throne, probably normally a son of the chief queen conceived in sacred marriage rites.

Apart from the distinctive use of the formulae *ydd il*, *mdd il* occurring in Ugarit, there is no evidence of a levantine precedent for the Judahite usage discussed above, and while it need not be derived from any external source at all, it is not unreasonable to see the new monarchies of southern Palestine in the late eleventh century looking to established patterns and ideologies in the kingdoms around them as a guide to how they might behave. This is certainly the estimation of the Deuteronomist (1 Sam 8,5), although he writes from a somewhat later perspective. Since the region lay firmly within the Egyptian sphere of influence at the time, the Egyptian usage just dealt with seems a plausible source of inspiration⁽¹⁵⁾.

If we turn now to the Ugaritic material, we find what at first glance is a completely different situation from that obtaining in the Egyptian and Judahite contexts, because we are dealing here not with

⁽¹³⁾ See A. H. GARDINER, "The coronation of King Haremhab", *JEA* 39 (1953) 13-31 for translation and discussion.

⁽¹⁴⁾ The Persian kings do not use the formula, perhaps in accordance with the negative attitudes towards Egyptian cults suggested by the Elephantine letter § 30. 14 (*ANET* 492a).

⁽¹⁵⁾ The supposed (mutilated) fivefold titulary in Isa 9,5-7, modelled loosely on Egyptian procedure, would bear out the argument that Judah looked to Egypt for inspiration: KAISER, *Isaiah*, 124, 129f. There is however a circular argument in this supposition, because Kaiser states that the assumption of a lost fifth title is "especially necessary because of the fivefold Egyptian throne name...". It is necessary only if supposed in order to establish the correspondance! We shall note a more plausible example from Ugarit below.

historical conditions and actual royal protocol, but with mythology. However, we shall see that there are reasons for treating it here, because this particular mythology, the AB cycle, is intimately connected with the themes of order and power, the chief concerns of kingship⁽¹⁶⁾.

The evidence is as follows (text numbers given in *KTU* 1. series, *UT* in parenthesis):

of Yam: *mdd il[l]* 1 iv 20 ('nt pl. X iv 20) (on 1 iv 14-20 see below); *mdd il ym* 3 iii 38f., 4 ii 34 ('nt iv 40, 51 ii 34);

of Mot *ydd il ġzr* 4 vii 46f., viii 31f., 5 i 8, ii 9, 6 vi 30f. (51 vii 46f., viii 31f., 67 i 8, ii 9, 49 vi 30f.) (always || *bn ilm mt*); *ydd bn il ġzr* (omit *bn*?) 5 i 13f. (67 i 13f.) (|| *bn ilm mt*); *ydd* 4 vii 48, 5 iii 10, 26 (51 vii 48, 67 iii 10, 26) (|| *mt*); *mdd ilm mt* 4 viii 23f. (51 viii 23f.).

(The precise construction in 3 v 8 ['nt v 26] is uncertain. Most scholars take *b[yd]* to refer to Mot's hand, but it is possibly a further variation on the formula.)

The two forms *ydd* and *mdd* appear from the usage here to be equivalent in their meaning, though presumably they are to be construed differently⁽¹⁷⁾. There is no need to alter one of them: they may represent poetic or dialectal alternatives (cf. *yādīd*, *dōd* above), though the form *mdd il mt* in 4 viii 23f. (51 viii 23f.) may be an error for *ydd il mt*, the different forms *mdd* and *ydd* being then used consistently of Yam and Mot respectively.

It is no coincidence that the two deities said to be 'beloved of El' are both represented as royal figures: Mot is the ruler of a 'city' – sc. the Netherworld – 5 ii 15 (67 ii 15), while Yam is given the royal titles *zbl*||*tpṭ* ('Prince', 'Lord/Ruler') 2iv 14f. (68: 14) and frequently, *b'l* and *adn* ('Lord', 'Master') 2 i 33f., 45 (137: 33f., 45), and a whole series of titles in what appears to be a coronation cer-

⁽¹⁶⁾ See in particular D. L. PETERSEN and M. WOODWARD, "Northwest Semitic religion: a study of relational structures", *UF* 9 (1977) 233-248.

⁽¹⁷⁾ C. H. GORDON construes *mdd* as a passive participle from the simple conjugation of *ydd* (*modūd-* < **mawdūd-*: *UT* § 9. 24, 78). This would be a more likely explanation of *ydd*, supposing that it was vocalised *yadūd*, though the Hebrew form suggests an adjective vocalised *yadīd*. The prefixed *m-* of *mdd* points to a D-form passive participle (= Hebrew pual) perhaps vocalised *muddad*.

emony in 1 iv 14-20 ('nt pl. X iv 14-20). This passage is worth considering in detail:

<i>w y'n ltpn il d p[ilid]</i>		(Then the Compassionate, the M[erciful] El spoke []:)
<i>šm bny yw il[]</i>	<i>/(¹⁸)</i>	The name of my son is Lord of the god[s?]
15 <i>w p'r šm ym[]</i>	<i>/</i>	and he pronounces the name Sea[]
<i>t'nyn l zntn []</i>	<i>/</i>	they reply: For our sustenance []
<i>at adn tp'r []</i>	<i>/</i>	you shall be proclaimed Lord []
<i>ank ltpn il d [pid]</i>	<i>/(¹⁹)</i>	I am the Compassionate, the [Merciful] El []
<i>'l ydm p'rt []</i>	<i>/</i>	Over my hands(²⁰) I pronounce []
20 <i>šmk mdd i[l]</i>	<i>/</i>	Your name is Beloved of El[]

In spite of the poor condition of the tablet (depending on one's assessment of the original width of the column, perhaps two or three characters are missing at the end of line 14, increasing to half the text by line 20) a reasonable translation is possible of the remaining words, although full allowance should be made for *lacunae*; from this we may tentatively reconstruct a fivefold titulary:

- I Lord of the gods (line 14)
- II Sea (line 15)
- III Lord (line 17)
- IV (missing - lacuna in line 19 - perhaps *tpṭ nhr?*)
- V Beloved of El (line 20).

Perhaps the missing parts of the text would have supplied the general ideological affirmations such as fill out the Egyptian titulary

(¹⁸) The line breaks off with a horizontal stroke, variously read as *t* (so *KTU*) or *m* (A. MURTONEN, *A philological and literary treatise on the Old Testament divine names* אֱלֹהִים, אֱלֹהִים, אֱלֹהִים, and יְהוָה [Helsinki 1952] 49, n. 4). On the significance of *yw*, see MURTONEN, *op. cit.*, 51ff. I find J. LEWY's Hurrian theory of interest ("Influences hurrites sur Israël", *RES* 1938, 55ff.) because it offers a plausible, if unproven, explanation of the curious phoneme *yw* (*yau*) occurring in a number of disparate contexts, and defying explanation in Semitic terms. I have discussed the element *yh* (< *yw*) in the name of the (Hurrian) Uriah the Hittite, with references, in *StTh* 38 (n. 1 above).

(¹⁹) Cf. J. C. L. GIBSON, *Canaanite myths and legends* (Edinburgh 1978²) 39, G. DEL OLMO LETE, *Mitos y leyendas de Canaán* (Madrid 1981) 159.

(²⁰) El's hands are presumably placed in blessing on Yam's head.

from a bald list of names to a grandiloquent triumphant statement. It may be countered that my proposal here has the same weakness as the suggested reading of a titulary in Isa 9,5-7 (n. 15): that is, only four elements are actually found. But while to propose a missing fifth element in the biblical case requires violence to the text, in the present instance there is a gap precisely at the right point. It is, so to speak, an *argumentum haud e silentio, sed e spatio*! If for the sake of argument we accept the above proposal, then it is perhaps significant that the key element with which we are concerned, the title 'Beloved-of-DN', corresponds in position here to the normative use of New Kingdom times, the fifth. While we know nothing of the ritual procedures of Ugaritic coronations, the antiphonal nature of the present passage, suggested by line 16, may echo actual liturgical practice, and the giving of a blessing (and if my recognition of a titulary is correct, of a fourth name, being perhaps the throne name?) over hands held on the head may be modelled on an established tradition. So perhaps we have here the evidence on which to begin the analysis of Ugaritic royal ritual.

The supposition of the presence of titularies based, if only in the most general terms, on Egyptian models in both Ugarit and Judah suggests that the usage in both places concerning the title 'Beloved-of-DN' is derived from Egypt, rather than demonstrating any more direct link between the two. Perhaps future discoveries from the Levant, giving more details of royal protocol in the region, will lead to a modification of this proposition.

It is to be noted that in the formula 'Beloved-of-DN' as used in the royal, and therefore ideological contexts discussed above, the deity named in the formula is always himself intimately concerned with the general principles embodied in the monarchy, that is, the maintenance of social stability, territorial integrity, and so forth, commonly symbolised by cosmic management, lordship of a pantheon, and creativity (itself the apotheosis of the king's role as fecundator - cf. the cultivator/gardener motif cited above). This is clearly the case with Yahweh in Judah, El (of whom Yahweh is best construed as a southern form)⁽²¹⁾ in Ugarit, and all the Egyptian deities ap-

⁽²¹⁾ Cf. F. M. CROSS, *Canaanite myth and Hebrew epic* (Cambridge, Mass., 1973) 71-73. I see Jerusalem rather than Midian as the locus of the pre-Judahite cult of Yahweh.

pearing in the formula, Amun, Ra', Ptah and Isis. Since from Middle Kingdom times Amun and Ra' had coalesced, we may consider the usage *mr-Imn* to be precisely the equivalent of *s3 R'*, just as in effect the king in Judah is both Yahweh's son and his beloved, and Yam is said to be both El's son and his beloved, as also is Mot in the formulae cited above.

A few remarks are in order about the particular circumstances of the Ugaritic material discussed. The AB cycle is concerned with the establishment of power and the resolution of the conflicts implicit in the world (sc. between the powers of chaos and cosmos – Yam and Ba'al, and between those of life and death – Ba'al and Mot.). There is of course no justification for reading into the text a further conflict between Ba'al and El. Rather, as Petersen and Woodward have shown⁽²²⁾, do we have a macro- and micro-cosmic double schema, where the violent events going on at a lower level echo El's continuing management of cosmic order above.

Under the overall aegis of El's macrocosmic kingship we have in fact no less than four rival kings among the gods:

- i) Yam's coronation appears to be the occasion of the passage discussed above, and Kotar is summoned to build him a palace (see below). We have also noted his other titles.
- ii) Mot's titles and rule over a city indicate royal status, as noted above; we also noted the equivalence of the motifs of the beloved and the son. In the formula *bn ilm mt* I take the *m* at the end of *ilm* to be an old mimation surviving in a liturgical formula⁽²³⁾. Cf. also 6 vi 26-29 (49 vi 26-29).
- iii) 'Aṭtar appears to have had a claim to the throne, as can be discerned in the mutilated text of 2 iii (129): in line 12 Gibson reads '*ttr dm[lk]*', and renders as 'Athtar, the possessor [of kingship]'⁽²⁴⁾.

⁽²²⁾ See n. 16 above. The theory of El's deposition, propounded by M. H. POPE, *El in the Ugaritic texts* (Leiden 1955) and U. OLDENBURG, *The conflict between El and Ba'al in Canaanite religion* (Leiden 1969) is disproved by C. L'HEUREUX, *Rank among the Canaanite gods* (Missoula 1979) 18-49. On El as the final arbiter in Ugaritic thought see also S. B. PARKER, "The historical composition of *KRT* and the cult of El", *ZAW* 89 (1977) 161-175.

⁽²³⁾ The same archaic form may be found in the biblical *b'nē 'ēlīm* – to be construed as 'sons of El' – in Pss 29,1 and 89,7 (EVV 6, || *sōd q'dōšīm* in v. 8, EVV 7). Cf., too, the expression *b'nē 'lōhīm* in Job 1,6 etc.

⁽²⁴⁾ GIBSON, *Canaanite Myths*, 37. Cf. DEL OLMO LETE, *Mitos*, 166.

Šapšu refers in line 18 to '[the throne] of your kingship' in speaking to him; he complains about having no palace in line 19, and however precisely construed, he appears in lines 22f. to be excluded from kingship because he has no wife. To judge from his role in 6 i 43ff. (49: 15ff.), his role here is to be a substitute king for Ba'al, and perhaps echoes an older (pre-Ba'al) situation in which he was, as the firstborn of El and Ašerah, the natural embodiment of kingship⁽²⁵⁾. iv) Ba'al emerges as king through his double victory over Yam and Mot: 2 iv 10, 32, 3 v 32f., 6 vi 33-35 (68: 10, 32, 'nt v 40f., 49 vi 33-35).

What is the significance of the fact that Ba'al, the king, is not only in conflict with other kings, but appears to have the lesser claim to his throne (except by his final establishment of power through *force majeure*), in face of the formula of legitimation *ydd/mdd il* applied to Yam and Mot? Put another way, how can he become king in view of the legitimacy of the rival claims? Perhaps to demand total consistency of the kind that irons out problems of this sort is to demand too much, but a partial answer at least may be discerned in the earlier part of the cycle, where we have a nice literary irony reminiscent of the Balaam story in Numbers 22-24. There the prophet is called up by Barak king of Moab to pronounce curses on the Israelite tribes, but reverses the situation by blessing them. Here Kotar is called upon to build a palace for Yam (Aṭtar's complaint perhaps to be construed as a further irony, anticipating the fact that his rival Yam's position will not go unchallenged), and ends up by helping Ba'al to overcome Yam. Instead of 'blessing' Yam with the practical benefit of a palace, which would have been the proper counterpart to El's ritual blessing, he 'curses' him through the agency of Ba'al's clubs. Instead of 'cursing' Ba'al by establishing his rival, he 'blesses' him in gaining victory for him, and later confirms this blessing by the subsequent building of Ba'al's palace. (The undoubtedly royal aspect of the Balaam oracles – cf. in particular Num 23,21; 24,7.17 – suggests that this literary form – of the blessing which overwhelms any curse, and establishes a king's

⁽²⁵⁾ I take *aḥd* in i 46 (62: 46) to be an ordinal – 'first' – which need not be taken in terms of primogeniture (though I think here it does, in a primordial sense), but can also mean first in rank. Cf. my note "Aṭtar and the devil", *TGUOS* 24 (1973-4) 85-97, where I also suggested that Yam, Mot and Aṭtar were in effect three hypostases of the same deity.

dominion beyond dispute – is in fact derived from a Canaanite milieu, the Ugaritic material providing an early example of the motif).

The subsequent conflict between Ba'al and Mot is an echo of this, as is recognised by M. K. Wakeman, who sees the two conflicts as variations on the one theme⁽²⁶⁾. Yam and Mot are both in a sense 'raw cosmic material' – note that Petersen and Woodward consider them to be a category apart from the other gods of the pantheon⁽²⁷⁾ – which has to be beaten into shape, as it were, in order to establish Ba'al's microcosm. Yam and Mot are both scattered, which in the context is to be seen as an image of transformation⁽²⁸⁾. In a sense, Yam and Mot represent an 'anti-kingdom', which must be overturned to give rise to Ba'al's kingdom⁽²⁹⁾. These realities constitute, on the microcosmic scale, chaos and cosmos, ever at war, ever on the verge of transition from the one condition to the other. On the macrocosmic scale, far above the little problems of the world below, the chief God smiles benignly.

Dept. of Religious Studies
University of Glasgow
Glasgow G12 8QQ
Scotland

N. WYATT

⁽²⁶⁾ M. K. WAKEMAN, *God's battle with the monster* (Leiden 1973) 38f.

⁽²⁷⁾ "Northwest", 238 (diagram R₀); 240 (diagram S₀).

⁽²⁸⁾ Yam: 2 iv 28ff. (68: 28ff.) (GIBSON, *Canaanite Myths*, 45f.); Mot: 6 ii 30ff., v 11ff. (49 ii 30ff., v 11ff.). W. D. O'FLAHERTY, *Hindu myths* (Harmondsworth 1975) 13, points out that in India there is no real creation tradition – the world order is established by the transformation and reorganisation of a prior order. This principle applies widely too in ancient Near Eastern myth.

⁽²⁹⁾ The same principle is found in the conflict between Asuras (earlier, ancient primordial gods of the pre-cosmos, later demons) and Devas (gods of the cosmos) which forms a primary theme in Indian mythology. This is commonly expressed in terms of Who rules the world? or Who possesses the territory (of India)? It is an opposition of kingships.

ANIMADVERSIONES

No Sign of Jonah

In Mark 8,12 Jesus asks why "this generation" demands a "sign". He then states that no sign will be given it. In parallel texts from Matthew (16,4; 12,39) and Luke (11,29) Jesus makes a significant qualification: "... except the sign of Jonah". The discrepancy has exercised the ingenuity of scholars. The present note proposes in outline form and as an hypothesis the following solution: the denial of a sign in Mark is to be understood as the elimination in Mark's gospel of official witness to the risen Jesus so that the risen Jesus does not serve as God's sign formally and explicitly witnessing to the truth of who Jesus is and what he says; instead, Mark has the earthly Jesus witness to himself before the Sanhedrin.

There is no reason to doubt the authenticity of the synoptic "sign" texts as they stand⁽¹⁾. What is needed is a study of them in their context⁽²⁾.

A "sign" (σημεῖον) is an indication given as a testimony of trustworthiness⁽³⁾. In all three synoptic gospels the opponents of Jesus challenge him to have his authority witnessed to by God ("from heaven")⁽⁴⁾.

The "sign of Jonah" is best taken as the risen Jesus, the phrase "of Jonah" being understood as an explanatory genitive⁽⁵⁾: just as Jonah himself was a sign after he came forth from the sea-beast⁽⁶⁾, so Jesus is a sign after his "three days" in the tomb⁽⁷⁾. Some exegetes hold that the preaching of Jesus is the sign, but this view seems difficult to reconcile not only with the

(1) In *NA²⁶* the sections of the verses in Matthew, Mark, and Luke in which the sign is discussed are textually certain.

(2) For a convenient summary and thoughtful evaluation of the whole problem see R. A. EDWARDS, *The Sign of Jonah in the Theology of the Evangelists and Q* (SBT Second Series 18; London 1971). See also A. VÖGTLE, "Der Spruch vom Jonaszeichen", in *Synoptischen Studien* [Festschrift Alfred Wikenhauser] (München 1953) 230-289.

(3) Cf. O. LINTON, "The Demand for a Sign from Heaven (Mk 8,11-12 and Parallels)", *ST* 19 (1965) 123-124.

(4) The phrase "from heaven" could possibly refer to the *place* of witness (cf. Matt 24,23-27), and an allusion to this possibility should not be ruled out. But the primary meaning is probably divine origin. See the discussion in J. GNILKA, *Das Evangelium nach Markus*. 1. Teilband. Mk 1 - 8,26 (EKKNT II/1); Zürich and Neukirchen-Vluyn 1978) 306. Cf. also LINTON, "Sign", 128-129.

(5) For the background of this construction cf. M. ZERWICK, *Graecitas biblica* (Romae 1966) §§ 45-46 (pp. 16-17).

(6) On a human being as sign cf. K. RENGSTORF, art. "σημεῖον", *TWNT* VII, 232.

(7) On the symbolism of the period "three days" cf. P. LAPIDE, *Auferstehung. Ein jüdisches Glaubenserlebnis* (Stuttgart-München 1977) 49-50.

need for a divine origin of the sign⁽⁸⁾ but also with the future tense "will be given" at Matt 16,4/12,39 and Luke 11,29, for Jesus had already been preaching⁽⁹⁾. A sign should correspond intrinsically with what is being witnessed to⁽¹⁰⁾. The risen Jesus corresponds well with who Jesus was — king at the moment of salvation, i.e., the Messiah who makes possible entry into eternal life. Eternal life provides the common background of the gospel story (e.g., Matt 7,14; 18,8,9; 19,16.17.29; 25,46; Mark 9,43.45; 10,17.30; Luke 12,25; 12,15; 16,25; 18,18.30).

What Mark seems to be saying by his silence about Jonah is that the sign of the risen Jesus will not be used in his gospel as a witness to who Jesus is. The absence of reference to the sign of Jonah at Mark 8,12 is thus of a piece with the way in which the resurrection is treated in Mark: the risen Jesus is never portrayed⁽¹¹⁾; the witness to Jesus' resurrection is a single "young man" (Mark 16,5) who by Mosaic Law is not sufficient for official witness⁽¹²⁾; he appears to women whose testimony is not valid for official witness⁽¹³⁾; in any event the women tell no one (Mark 16,8)⁽¹⁴⁾. For Mark the resurrection of Jesus is a reality which is not officially verifiable: it has no official witness value. The resurrection of Jesus exists for Mark, but not as a sign.

The lack of a witness value of the resurrection in Mark contrasts with the care with which Matthew and Luke show that it is verifiable. In Matthew the risen Jesus is portrayed as appearing in Galilee where he commis-

(8) Cf. RENGSTORF, "σημεῖον", 231.

(9) Cf. J. JEREMIAS, art. "Ἰωνάς", *TWNT* III, 412.

(10) Cf. Matt 16,2-3 and LINTON, *Signs*, 119-120.

(11) On the ending of Mark at 16,8 cf. V. TAYLOR, *The Gospel according to St. Mark* (London 1953) 610, and J. D. M. DERRETT, *The Anastasis: The Resurrection of Jesus as an Historical Event* (Shipston-on-Stour, Warwickshire 1982) 135.

(12) Cf. H. VAN VLIET, *No Single Testimony. A Study on the Adoption of the Law of Deut. 19:15 Par. into the New Testament* (STRT 4; Utrecht 1958) 88-89.

(13) There is no official statement to that effect in the New Testament, but the way the resurrection accounts in Matthew, Luke, and John are structured would seem to indicate as much. Women are the first to receive messages about the risen Jesus or even the first to see the risen Jesus, but this always happens in function of their bringing the news to the disciples, never to anyone else. Cf. Matt 28,7.10; Luke 24,9; John 20,2.17. Cf also E. MANICARDI, *Il cammino di Gesù nel Vangelo di Marco. Schema narrativo e tema cristologico* (AnBib 96; Rome 1981) 181-182, n. 43: "Pur essendo le prime a essere raggiunte dall'ἡγέρθη (16,6) e pur portando ai discepoli il messaggio del giovane, esse non possono essere considerate come le prime annunciatrici. Questo ruolo spetta piuttosto ai discepoli e il primo piano ai dodici (3,13-19; 6,7-13; 9,2-13)".

(14) Manicardi (ibid.) interprets Mark 16,8 to mean that the women told no one outside the circle of the disciples and thinks that Mark wants to make a contrast between the maintaining secret of the manifestation of the risen Jesus here (known through the message of the young man) and the proclamation of some manifestation of Jesus elsewhere in the gospel (e.g., 1,28; 5,14-16). Manicardi goes on to state that the motivation for such silence in Mark is difficult to determine with certainty ("Il motivo di tale silenzio in Mc è difficile da stabilire con sicurezza"). The motive seems clear: Mark does not want to portray the resurrection as being attested to in any way.

sions "the eleven disciples" to baptize (28,16-20)⁽¹⁵⁾. In Luke the risen Jesus appears in Jerusalem and commissions "the eleven" to be witnesses (24,36-49)⁽¹⁶⁾. Thus in both these gospels the risen Jesus functions as the "sign of Jonah" in contrast to Mark where he does not⁽¹⁷⁾.

Mark seems to avoid using the resurrection as a divine witness to Jesus in order to allow Jesus to witness to himself before his death. When confronted with the high priest's question, "Are you the Christ, the son of the Blessed One", he solemnly replies: "I am" (14,62)⁽¹⁸⁾. The evocation of the Old Testament language used by God about himself is unmistakably significant if taken in the context of the gospel as a whole⁽¹⁹⁾. There is no such categorical affirmation by Jesus in the trial scene in Matthew and Luke. In Matthew (26,63), Jesus is asked by the high priest: "I charge you by the living God to tell us if you are the Christ the son of God". He replies: "You have said so". This is to be taken not as an evasive reply⁽²⁰⁾ but as a refusal to make a direct claim to the messiahship: attestation of messiahship

⁽¹⁵⁾ The relation between baptism and the resurrection viewed as God's witness to Jesus offers interesting possibilities with regard to Matthew's doctrine of justification.

⁽¹⁶⁾ Cf. also Luke 24,33.

⁽¹⁷⁾ This does not mean, of course, that Mark does not know of the risen Jesus (cf. 16,6) or that he does not know of the appearance of the risen Jesus to his disciples (cf. 16,7 — Mark would scarcely have mentioned the *promise* of a manifestation if he did not think that the manifestation itself had taken place). These texts tend to confirm the hypothesis being presented in this paper, not to weaken it, for the fact remains that although Mark knows that Jesus is risen and knows that he appeared to his disciples, he does not use legally valid attestation to the resurrection. The question whether Mark did this because he was unaware of the possibility of the use of such attestation for witnessing to Jesus or because, being aware of the possibility, he did not use it, is, strictly speaking, irrelevant for the purpose of this paper. To the present writer it seems much more plausible that Mark was aware of the possibility but chose not to use it; otherwise one would have to hold either that Mark was unaware of the existing tradition(s) of such attestation which eventually appeared in the other gospels, or that such traditions did not exist when Mark wrote. Neither of these options seems plausible. Further, in 16,1-8 Mark seems deliberately to discourage the reader/hearer from thinking that he is reporting a legally verified event (cf. above, notes 11-14); this tactic seems difficult to reconcile with his being unaware that such legally verified attestation was possible.

⁽¹⁸⁾ Contrast the directness of this reply with the indirect nature of the reply to Pilate at 15,2 (the same in all four gospels). Taylor (*Mark*, 568) thinks that the original text at 14,62 had *οὐ εἶπας ὅτι ἐγὼ εἶμι*. But the manuscript witness for this reading is markedly inferior to that for the unqualified reply. Taylor seems to share with some ancient scribes the desire to harmonize Mark with Matthew and Luke and thus avoid a problem.

⁽¹⁹⁾ For background on the question cf. S. FEUILLET, "Les EGO EIMI christologiques du quatrième évangile", *RSR* 54 (1966) 5-22, 213-240. Feuillet regards the phrase as having a banal sense of admission of identity, but which is open to the transcendental connotation of divinity, and thinks that it is employed in both senses in Mark 6,50 and 13,6. But he thinks that only the banal meaning is involved at Mark 14,62 because the high priest's question is so direct: a direct answer to a direct question. But allusion cannot be turned on and off like a faucet.

⁽²⁰⁾ D. R. CATCHPOLE, "The Answer of Jesus to Caiphas (Matt xxvi. 64), *NTS* 17 (1970-1971) 213-226.

can come only from God⁽²¹⁾. Here Matthew is preparing the way for the attestation of messiahship which will come from God with the resurrection. In Luke (22,67-70), the dialogue comes to much the same thing as in Matthew, with Jesus finally replying: "You say that I am" to the question of the Sanhedrin about his being the son of God⁽²²⁾. Again, attestation of messiahship can come only from God, and in Luke as in Matthew it comes with the resurrection.

Thus there is a fundamental difference in perspective between Mark on the one hand and Matthew and Luke on the other. In Mark, Jesus directly asserts that he is Son of God while also asserting explicitly that he is Messiah; in Matthew and Luke, Jesus indirectly asserts that he is Messiah while implying that he is also Son of God.

The reason why there can be fundamental differences in perspective between Mark and Matthew/Luke is the basic polyvalence of the phrase "son of God". The phrase has a wide range of meanings: the wise man, the suffering just man, the angels, Israel, as well as the meaning peculiar to Christianity of Jesus inasmuch as he has a unique relationship of parity with God⁽²³⁾. Since the phrase thus serves as the ground for diverse interpretations, it also demands a resolution of its basic ambiguity. Mark has Jesus take God's place in giving witness to himself. This is at the center of the hypothesis being proposed here as Mark's solution to the problem of the ambiguity of "son of God": by having Jesus take God's place in witnessing to himself, Mark implies that Jesus has a unique relationship of parity with God⁽²⁴⁾. This is the context for interpreting the phrase "I am" with which Jesus answers the high priest's question. By itself the phrase would be suggestive; in the context of Jesus taking God's place as witness, the phrase is unmistakable.

In asserting that he is God the Markan Jesus also asserts that he is Messiah. For that is the question of the high priest at Mark 14,61: "Are you the Christ the son of the Blessed One?"⁽²⁵⁾. Thus the primary and immediate communication made by Jesus to his listeners is that he is Messiah. Only Mark's Christian readers, with the aid of Christian tradition developed after the resurrection, would be able to see the full implications of the title "son of the Blessed One" with regard to divinity. But the Sanhedrin would seem to be portrayed by Mark as having an inkling of what is involved, for apart

⁽²¹⁾ J. C. O'NEILL, "The Silence of Jesus", *NTS* 15 (1968-1969) 153-167.

⁽²²⁾ It is interesting to compare the thought of Luke 22,66-71 with John 10,24-36.

⁽²³⁾ Cf. GNILKA, *Markus*, I, 60-64.

⁽²⁴⁾ The author of the Epistle to the Hebrews chooses another means for resolving the ambiguity of "son of God". Cf. J. SWETNAM, *Jesus and Isaac. A Study of the Epistle to the Hebrews in the Light of the Aqedah* (AnBib 94; Rome 1981) 149-150.

⁽²⁵⁾ On the phrase "Blessed One" for God cf. TAYLOR, *Mark*, 568. The gospels seem to presume a link between the phrase "son of God" and the Messiah. Besides the trial scenes (Matt 26,63; Mark 14,61; Luke 22,67-70) cf. John 1,34,49; 11,27; 20,31 and Matt 16,16. On non-biblical attestation of such a link cf. GNILKA, *Markus*, I, 61: "Die Belege erweisen, dass der titulare Gebrauch des Sohnes Gottes für den Messias zumindest vorbereitet war, wenn er sich nicht schon in einem gewissen Sinn eingebürgert haben sollte".

from the use of the phrase "I am" and his direct reply, Jesus implies transcendental status for himself by applying Ps 110,1 to himself as the "son of Man" of Dan 7⁽²⁶⁾. This seems to be the reason for the charge of blasphemy and as such indicates that the Sanhedrin was aware that something more than the claim to messiahship was at stake⁽²⁷⁾.

For Matthew and Luke, on the other hand, Jesus indirectly asserts that he is Messiah by his words "You state it" (Matt 26,64) and "You say that I am" (Luke 22,70) in answer to the high priest's question in Matthew and the Sanhedrin's question in Luke. The conjunction of Ps 110,1 and "son of Man" in both Matthew and Luke provides the same implication of transcendental status as in Mark, so that Jesus scandalizes those present, as in Mark. But the affirmation is only by implication: the Christian readers of Matthew and Luke do not find in the Sanhedrin scene the same warrant for immediate insight into Jesus' divinity as they do in Mark⁽²⁸⁾.

Thus the fact that there is no sign of Jonah in Mark seems to be of a piece with his treatment of Jesus, while the fact that there is the sign of Jonah in Matthew and Luke seems to be of a piece with their treatment of him.

Pontifical Biblical Institute
Via della Pilotta, 25
00187 Rome, Italy

James SWETNAM, S. J.

⁽²⁶⁾ Cf. A. F. SEGAL, *Two Powers in Heaven. Early Rabbinic Reports about Christianity and Gnosticism* (Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity 25; Leiden 1977) 206-209. Cf. especially p. 207: "... when used in connection with Dan. 7:13, the first clause of psalm 110 was certainly a support for the christological interpretation of the 'son of man.' No less, it served as testimony to the supreme dignity of the one whom the Christians called 'My Lord' and promised vindication for the believers". John 10,33-36 affirms explicitly a connection between blasphemy, the title "son of God", and divinity.

⁽²⁷⁾ Although the transcendental implications of the title "son of God" seem to have been an important factor in the scandal of the Jews at the trial of Jesus as portrayed by the synoptic evangelists, the antecedent intention of the enemies of Jesus to kill him should also be taken into consideration (cf. Mark 16,1-2; Matt 26,1-5; Luke 22,1-2; John 11,45-53): Jesus enters into his trial at the hands of the Sanhedrin with the latter portrayed by the evangelists as seeking a pretext for finding him guilty. Perhaps another and even more fundamental reason for the verdict against Jesus was the inability of his enemies to reconcile his claim to messiahship as expressed in Ps 110,1 with the implications of suffering contained in his allusion to Dan 7 where the "son of Man" refers to the Jewish martyrs taken collectively. In Mark this scandal in the face of Jesus' messianic claims seems indicated by the way Mark stresses the desire of the high priests and scribes under the cross to "see" and believe at Mark 15,32. Mark is the only synoptic to have the word "see" and he has it ordered to belief in Jesus as the Christ, the King of Israel. But his enemies demand that he first descend from the cross as a sign that he has been saved. The implication is that they were unable to reconcile the cross with the Messiah. Cf. also in this regard Mark 8,31-33 and parallels, Luke 24,46, Acts 3,18, and 1 Cor 1,23. Cf. also GNILKA, *Markus*, II, 283.

⁽²⁸⁾ It is Mark who affirms as his central thesis that Jesus is the Son of God. Cf. J. D. KINGSBURY, *The Christology of Mark's Gospel* (Philadelphia 1983) 47-155.

RECENSIONES

Vetus Testamentum

Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament. In Verbindung mit G. W. ANDERSON, H. CAZELLES, D. N. FREEDMAN, SH. TALMON und G. WALLIS herausgegeben von G. J. BOTTERWECK(†), H. RINGGREN, H.-J. FRABRY. Band IV: מ-ל. Pp. xvi, cc. 1-1140 e pp. [571-595] Stuttgart-Berlin-Köln-Mainz 1984. Verlag W. Kohlhammer.

A distanza di due anni dalla pubblicazione del vol. III 1982, appare il vol. IV. Il comitato di redazione s'è ormai reso conto (p. VII) dell'impossibilità di mantenere i limiti di tempo che in origine si era fissato (dieci anni per tutta l'opera); e ciò a causa delle nuove impostazioni di problemi antichi (il Pentateuco, il DtrH) o delle più recenti scoperte in campo filologico (valgano per tutte quelle di Ebla). Anche la morte prematura del prof. Botterweck nel 1981 è stata certamente un duro colpo per la redazione. Si tratta di argomenti che hanno evidentemente la loro validità e coi quali il lettore potrà solo simpatizzare, pur riconoscendo che il termine breve è stato scelto dalla, e non imposto alla redazione! E del resto in un lavoro come il *Wörterbuch* non è stato tanto importante, come tutti del resto sappiamo, terminare per tempo, quanto curare la qualità degli articoli, anche se questo significa non mantenere determinati termini. E tale qualità il lettore ha tutto il diritto di attendersi, trattandosi di un'*équipe* di autori internazionalmente famosi.

Del resto anche qualcosa di più il lettore avrebbe il diritto di esigere: la cura formale dell'opera. Ed è proprio qui (e non nella qualità degli articoli, per fortuna) che anche il vol. IV si rivela piuttosto mancante. Da anni andiamo ormai ripetendo che non ha alcun senso citare opere come R. de Vaux, *Les institutions de l'Ancien Testament*, Paris 1957-60, in traduzione tedesca; similmente avviene alcune volte per W. F. Albright, *Archaeology and the Religion of Israel*, Baltimore - London ³1953 (c. 225). Tali citazioni sono semplicemente vane per chi ha l'originale, e ciò vale anche per buona parte degli studiosi di lingua tedesca. Anche in altri casi notiamo non poche inesattezze formali: alla c. 341 R. de Vaux è diventato addirittura R. P. de Vaux; alla c. 499 abbiamo A. Hillel Silver per A. H. Silver; alla c. 596 H. Champbell Thompson per A. C. Thompson; alla c. 1064 W. Boyd Barrick per W. B. Barrick; il contrario avviene invece alla c. 1086 dove L. Monsengwo-Pasinya appare come L. M. Pasinya. Alla c. 718 C. Zaccagnini, *Lo scambio dei doni*, Roma 1973 appare come articolo in *OrAnt* 11 (1973). Regolarmente poi il *van* olandese-fiammingo-sudafricano e il *de* francese-olandese appare in minuscola in autori nordamericani, dove invece va sempre con la maiuscola. Per l'opera storiografica dtr., invece dell'ormai internazionalmente accettata

sigla DtrH abbiamo DtrGW. Sono questi elementi che complicano l'uso dell'opera, rendono in non pochi casi difficile la ricerca bibliografica; ed è un peccato perché caratteristica di una opera di consultazione come questa dev'essere proprio la celerità con la quale la si può utilizzare.

Per questioni che si riferiscono più alla sostanza, mi domando se le radici *kōl/kll* e *klh* non avrebbero dovuto essere trattate insieme, dato l'orizzonte semantico affine. L'ho proposto io stesso oltre dieci anni fa («*klh-kll*: osservazioni sull'uso di due radici in ebraico biblico», *AION* 32 (1972) 366-371, inglese in *Old Testament and Oriental Studies*, Roma 1975, 210-215). Per *ks'* l'autore vede nel termine uno sviluppo simile a quello di *špt* (da «giudicare» a «governare»), sulla scorta di G. Liedke, *Gestalt und Bezeichnung alttestamentlicher Rechtssätze* (Neukirchen 1971) 70 ss.; ma, a parte il fatto che il Liedke non dice questo, la tesi di *špt* mi sembra ampiamente confutata dall'uso della radice in semitico occidentale (dal sec. XVIII a.C. in avanti) ed in testi arcaicizzanti ebraici; cfr. del resto anche alla c. 938. Alla c. 538 l'autore della voce *lhm* si è confrontato col problema che la radice può indicare anche la «carne» ed il «cibo» in generale. Per chi vive nel mondo mediterraneo il fatto che «pane» stia per «cibo» non ha nulla di strano (cfr. del resto il Padre Nostro); ma è necessaria una spiegazione quanto meno bizzarra come la seguente: «Carne/pane hanno come caratteristica comune quella di una massa morbida, appiccicosa...»?

Per il resto, l'opera mantiene sul piano sostanziale gli alti livelli ai quali è venuta abituandoci nel corso di questi tre lustri. Particolarmente buone ed utili appaiono le voci *kn'n*, *kpr*, *krwb*, *krt* (contro E. Kutsch), *lb*, *mdbr*, *mwt* e *mlk*.

Via Pietro Cossa, 42
I-00193 Roma.

J. A. SOGGIN

Robert MARTIN-ACHARD, *Amos. L'homme, le message, l'influence*, Publications de la Faculté de Théologie de l'Université de Genève N° 7. 320 p. 22×15. Genève 1984. Labor et Fides.

Il panorama dell'esegesi si è venuto arricchendo in questi anni di una serie di commentari, monografie e articoli consacrati ad Amos. Le ragioni di un simile interesse coincidono probabilmente con quelle indicate da Martin-Achard nell'introduzione alla sua opera (p. 9). In primo luogo, Amos è il più antico dei profeti scrittori: sembra che negli studi biblici perduri il fascino dell'idea che i fenomeni più remoti siano i più importanti perché più genuini e autentici. Inoltre, la raccolta degli oracoli di Amos, nonostante la sua brevità, presenta la maggior parte dei problemi di natura storica, letteraria e religiosa presenti pure negli altri libri profetici: avremmo qui una motivazione di indole pedagogica, collegata con il genere letterario dell'introduzione al

profetismo; forse ci viene anche rivelato che il libro di Amos si presta assai bene come campione di esercizi metodologici. Infine, si deve riconoscere che, nonostante l'abbondanza dei contributi, rimane l'impressione che questo profeta sia stato «poco letto e spesso mal compreso dalla tradizione ebraica o cristiana», e ancora oggi non riconosciuto adeguatamente nella specificità del suo messaggio: è ragionevole pensare, tra l'altro, che l'istanza della giustizia sociale, così vivamente sentita ai nostri giorni, abbia favorito la riscoperta di Amos e della attualità della sua predicazione.

Il contributo di Martin-Achard rinuncia al genere letterario del commentario per assumere la forma del saggio che dibatte i principali problemi concernenti il libro di Amos. Come è indicato dal sottotitolo, l'opera si distribuisce in tre parti, fra loro logicamente connesse. La I^a si occupa dell'*uomo*, del suo ambiente e delle sue attività (pp. 11-45): fra i problemi più discussi vi è quello della professione di Amos nel suo rapporto al ministero profetico. La II^a parte verte sul *messaggio* (pp. 47-159): oltre alle questioni introduttorie (lingua, formazione del libro, autenticità, ambiente teologico e sociale), vengono in questa parte affrontate le tematiche specifiche del profeta: il diritto e il culto, le visioni, lo statuto di Israele e delle nazioni, con una conclusione sulla intenzionalità del messaggio di Amos (condanna radicale o estremo appello alla conversione?). La III^a parte infine si occupa della *influenza* esercitata dal libro di Amos nella Scrittura stessa, nella tradizione antica sia giudaica che cristiana, nell'epoca della riforma (con un precedente significativo nella figura di Savonarola), e nei tempi moderni (dal 1930 ai nostri giorni): questa sezione si presenta esplicitamente come una verifica, attraverso limitati sondaggi, delle affermazioni di L. Markert (TRE 2, 1977-1978, 471-487), con alcuni complementi per il periodo contemporaneo rilevanti per l'ambiente francofono.

L'autore si situa in dialogo continuo con gli studi recenti riguardanti Amos: i vari temi affrontati, così come il loro sviluppo interno, sono comandati dagli interventi degli esegeti succedutisi soprattutto negli ultimi anni. Ne consegue che il lettore viene ampiamente informato sulle principali opinioni in merito ad un determinato argomento, ma è anche non poco frastornato dal succedersi di posizioni contrapposte, senza che sia agevole capirne il fondamento, le motivazioni e le precise conseguenze nell'ambito interpretativo. La preoccupazione di «evocare le maniere diverse e persino contraddittorie» (p. 10) con cui i biblisti hanno interpretato Amos, sembra impedire all'autore una sua più evidente presa di posizione; d'altra parte denuncia lo statuto precario degli studi esegetici, che, pur presentandosi con l'apparato tecnico della scienza, non paiono fornire che dei contributi opinabili e ipotetici. Poiché il lettore spesso non è in grado di giudicare della pertinenza di una opinione che, per ovvi motivi, è presentata brevemente e senza precise giustificazioni, avremmo trovato più utile che l'autore stesso esponesse e motivasse il suo personale discorso, appoggiandosi a quanto di ragionevolmente documentato è stato scritto in precedenza.

La disamina storica sulla influenza di Amos evidenzia quanta parte abbia nell'esegesi la preoccupazione ideologica dei singoli autori. Ciò riguarda il passato, ma è ancora assai visibile ai nostri giorni, se è vero che i risultati conseguiti attraverso pazienti e metodici studi divergono considerevolmente.

Il doveroso rispetto per il parere altrui non dovrebbe esimere dal discernere sui presupposti per lo più sottaciuti di tali opinioni; più che un lavoro che tenti di sintetizzare risultati disparati, sembra oggi auspicato un esercizio ermeneutico più cosciente dei suoi limiti, e quindi maggiormente mediatore della parola viva del profeta (pp. 10, 271).

Pontificio Istituto Biblico
25, via della Pilotta
00187 Roma

Pietro BOVATI

Arthur J. FERCH, *The Son of Man in Daniel 7* (Andrews University Seminary Doctoral Dissertation Series, VI). x-237 p. 23x15. Berrien Springs, Michigan 1983. Andrews University Press.

This workmanlike dissertation done at Andrews University under the direction of Gerhard F. Hasel has a copyright date of 1979 (none of the works cited in the bibliography dates from after 1978) and was published in February, 1983. It arrived for review in *Biblica* in 1984. It is a welcome addition to study on a text of the Bible which is important perhaps more for the New Testament than for the Old.

Ferch begins his study with "A Survey of Post-New Testament Interpretations of the Son of Man in Daniel" (pp. 4-39). This review is rather cursory but none the less useful. The reviewer was surprised by the number of Jewish interpreters who understood the Danielic Son of Man as the Messiah. A more detailed study of exactly what the Jewish commentators meant and why they meant it would be a valuable exercise in Judaic studies and helpful to biblical scholars.

Ferch next goes on to discuss "The Son of Man of Daniel 7 and His Alleged Origins and Parallels" (pp. 40-107), rejecting suggestions that the Son of Man has roots and correspondences in Babylonian, Egyptian, Iranian, Hellenistic, Gnostic, or Ugaritic literature. Instead, "the fact that SM [Son of Man] and its surrounding imagery is cast in the language of traditional biblical motifs and figures corroborates the notion that an answer to the nature and identity of the SM should be sought within the OT" (p. 106). A number of specific texts are suggested.

In the third and final chapter Ferch discusses "Daniel 7 and the Son of Man" (pp. 108-184). He begins by affirming the basic unity of the chapter, particularly against Martin Noth and H. L. Ginsberg. He analyzes Dan 7, 1-14 (the vision) as a chiasm centering on the judgment at vv. 9-10, which are supplemented by vv. 13-14. This chiasm is in turn a part of the chiasmic form of the entire chapter which centers on vv. 17-18 and the assigning of the kingdom to the saints of the Most High. Among the opinions presented

concerning details of the chapter are the following: the verdict on the "insolent despot" symbolized by the little horn is "passed as a descriptive act" (p. 153) instead of being stated explicitly; the particle *k* in *kbr 'nš* is taken as indicating similarity rather than identity (pp. 154-158); the phrase *br 'nš* signifies "a single person within the human race" (p. 161); the theophanic cloud symbolism marks the Son of Man as a supranatural being (pp. 162-171); the Son of Man is "an individual, transcendent, eschatological being which exercises messianic royal powers" (p. 174) and he is distinct from the "saints of the Most High" but shares with them "the eternal and indestructible kingdom" (p. 180).

Ferch seems to be on the right track when he comes out for the basic unity and integrity of Dan 7. He also seems to be on the right track when he looks for the origin of the Son of Man imagery in the Old Testament. But the reviewer is not so certain about other positions which he takes.

Ferch seems to go astray by not pressing enough the Old Testament background of "Son of Man" as a descriptive title placing in relief human fragility. This fragility seems to be implied by the emphasis placed on the power of the four beasts and particularly of the fourth beast: the abruptness with which the Son of Man is introduced helps bring out this contrast. *Pace* Ferch, the Son of Man seems to be a symbol for the "saints of the Most High" – those martyrs of the Law who seem so fragile in contrast to the fearful and powerful fourth beast. (Ferch is puzzled by the "strange silence" as to where the Son of Man is coming from and who is ushering him into the divine presence [p. 173]. It is a problem of Ferch's own making, for by failing to identify the Son of Man with the saints he fails to recognize that there is question of martyrs being ushered into the divine presence by being killed).

The point of the passage seems to be that the martyrs of the Law are invested by God with eternal life, a sharing, if one will, in the divine authority and power. This divine authority and power contrasts with the fourth beast, whose death is stressed, and the other three beasts, now powerless (vv. 11-12). After the weakness of the saints is contrasted with the power of the live beasts, the weakness of the dead or powerless beasts is contrasted with the power of God into which the saints are subsumed. The cloud is a vivid way of ascribing to the martyrdom of the Son of Man/saints of the Most High the aura of divine acceptance of their sacrifice: he/they arrive in God's presence already in his favor.

The divine power is a power given in the context of the grant of immortality. Thus it would seem more likely than not that the author of Daniel did not look upon it as a directly Messianic power, for a directly Messianic power normally would seem to have been envisioned as being in some way or other salvific, i.e., oriented to the salvation of others. Why so many early Jewish commentators should see in the Son of Man a royal Messianic figure is accordingly a mystery for the present reviewer. The distinction made by contemporary Jewish scholars between the Son of Man and royal Messianic authority seems much more in agreement with the whole tenor of Dan 7.

The problems associated with Dan 7 have not yet been solved. Ferch's book helps, but the literary criticism which he employs doesn't seem to be

fully equal to the challenges which the text presents. Or at least so it seems to this amateur Daniel scholar.

Pontifical Biblical Institute
Via della Pilotta, 25
00187 Rome

James SWETNAM, S.J.

Novum Testamentum

Vernon K. ROBBINS, *Jesus the Teacher*. A Socio-Rhetorical Interpretation of Mark. xv-238 pp. 24×16. Philadelphia 1984. Fortress Press.

Many years ago the reviewer had occasion to act as tutor in English to a Spaniard who had not lived long in the United States of America. The Spaniard was enamored of *Time*, the weekly newsmagazine, and asked that the tutoring consist in his reading articles from the current issue out loud and having his pronunciation, interpretation, etc. corrected. For the tutor it was an eye-opening experience: time after time a pause had to be made to explain some allusion or some presupposition or some other aspect, all of which were instinctively and automatically supplied by any intelligent reader familiar with both the American scene and the biases of the magazine's editors.

If it is so difficult for an intelligent foreigner to come to grips with news-writing of his own age, how complex must be the process of trying to come to grips with the New Testament text, a text which comes from a time and a culture so different from the twentieth-century world of whatever country. Vernon K. Robbins, Associate Professor of Religious Studies and Classics at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, makes a significant contribution to this process in *Jesus the Teacher*. "It is my impression that we need a paradigm for research that keeps us in touch with Greek and Greco-Roman literature, as well as biblical and Jewish literature, as we interpret Mark. In order to do this, it is necessary to have a concept of 'form' different from the one in the disciplines of form and redaction criticism. After developing an alternative concept of 'form' inductively as I have read and reread biblical, Jewish, Hellenic, and Greco-Roman literature interchangeably for about a decade, I discovered that a portion of Kenneth Burke's work provided a framework for integrating the phenomena I had found" (p. xiii). "In my analysis I concur with Burke: 'A work has form in so far as one part of it leads a reader to anticipate another part, to be gratified by the sequence.'... Form is present where there is a strategy of communication that causes the reader to become an active participant in the process, anticipating sequences,

graining familiarity through repetition, and identifying with certain people and causes" (p. 7). This is a ringing manifesto and Robbins follows up brilliantly, although the reviewer has qualifications, as will be seen in the course of the following remarks.

Robbins identifies four kinds of "form" in his socio-rhetorical analysis: 1) progressive form, 2) repetitive form, 3) conventional form, and 4) minor form. "Minor form" denotes the type of things with which New Testament criticism has largely been working with for the past hundred years or so – the controversy stories, miracle stories, parables, sayings, Passion events, etc. of the form critics, and the metaphors, antitheses, parallelisms, etc. of the literary critics (p. 7). Robbins' work is concerned with the role of the minor forms in the setting of the other, primary, rhetorical forms. "Progressive form" is either "logical", in which assertions of the text are invested with expectation of fulfilment, or "qualitative", in which something unexpected or new is introduced (p. 9-10) "Repetitive form" is "the consistent maintaining of a principle in new guises, . . . [a] restatement of the same thing in different ways" (p. 10). "Conventional form" has to do with "categorical expectancy . . . anterior to the reading" (p. 10), as contrasted with progressive and repetitive forms, which arouse expectation during the process of reading (p. 10).

Within this framework Robbins develops his thesis that "the portrayal of a cycle of relationships between teacher and disciple from the moment of the call to discipleship until the time of the death of the teacher is a conventional form in Mediterranean literature" (p. 11). And he applies this thesis to the Gospel of Mark.

After setting up this framework in Chapter 1 ("Comparative Analysis of the Gospel of Mark" (pp. 1-17), Robbins devotes Chapter 2 to "The Formal Structure of Mark" (pp. 19-51). Here he makes much of a progressive form of three stages ("three-step progression") as manifested, for example, in the well-known triple repetition of the Passion predictions in Mark 8,31; 9,31; and 10,32-34 (p. 22-23). But he has overlooked a splendid example of a three-step progression in the use of "beloved son" which Mark, in contrast with Matthew and Luke, always quotes exactly the same way in 1,11; 9,7; and 12,6. Mark is here investing an Old Testament phrase connoting the death of an only child with a progressive revelation about the identity and destiny of Jesus. First Jesus alone, then a select group of apostles, and finally even Jesus' enemies become conversant with this profoundly meaningful description. This three-step form would seem to be a major element in the way in which Mark has consciously structured his Gospel (cf. *Bib* 65 [1984] 414).

Chapter 3 is devoted to "Conventional Repetitive Forms in Mark" (pp. 53-73) and Robbins argues that Mark has taken a basic pattern from prophetic literature and adapted it to the way disciple-gathering teachers are presented in Hellenic thought as found, for example, in Xenophon's *Memorabilia*. Robbins notes that conventional repetitive forms in prophetic biblical narrative have been changed "so that Jesus repeatedly points to himself as an authority without referring to the Lord as the source of his speech and action" (p. 60). He then attributes this aspect of Mark's Gospel to a "first-

century socio-rhetorical pattern in Mediterranean culture" (p. 60). Perhaps such culture had something to do with the change, but a more plausible explanation would seem to be that Mark was subtly suggesting that Jesus was Son of God in such a way that he could stand in God's stead: Mark must have had some definite view of what he meant by stating at the outset of his Gospel that Jesus was "Son of God", and having Jesus stand in God's stead would have been a powerful and unmistakable way of communicating this view.

In Chapters 4, 5, and 6 (pp. 75-196) Robbins devotes his attention to what he calls "rhetorical form" as it extends over the Gospel as a whole. As he sees it there are three main divisions of Mark, to which these three chapters correspond: the introduction (Mark 1,1-13), the body of the account (1,14 - 15,47), and the conclusion (16,1-8). To understand these sections, i.e., the entire Gospel of Mark, the rhetorical form of "biographical accounts of disciple-gathering teachers" must be studied (p. 75). Robbins sees the Markan account as an intermingling of Jewish and Greco-Roman traditions and spends much effort analyzing first the Old Testament and then Greek literature, especially Xenophon's *Memorabilia*, Plato's dialogues, and Philostratus's *Life of Apollonius of Tyana*. At one place (p. 78) Robbins touches on the question of the geographical framework of the Markan narrative; here he could profitably consult R. Manicardi's study of that aspect of the Gospel (*Il cammino di Gesù nel Vangelo di Marco* [Rome 1981]). At another spot, in his discussion of Mark 13, Robbins remarks: "The Jewish covenant system containing blessings and curses is replaced by a system of paideia that focuses upon the benefits that come from remaining steadfast to the system taught and manifested by the teacher" (p. 177). It would seem rather that the Jewish covenant system containing blessings and curses, i.e., the Old Covenant, is replaced by the New Covenant which has only blessings. In the context of the destruction of Jerusalem it is appropriate to note that God will never allow something similar to that destruction to happen to the people of the New Covenant because the curse of the Old Covenant has been removed by Christ (cf. Gal 3,13). Robbins' failure to make more of the institution of the New Covenant at the eucharistic meal is one of the more obvious shortcomings in his study.

The book ends with Chapter 7: "Messianic Expectation and Cultural Fulfillment; An Explanation of the Preservation of Mark" (pp. 197-213). Here Robbins ties the book together with a summary of his views about the various types of forms in the Gospel. He claims that the Gospel of Mark was preserved because "it perpetuated an image of Jesus, an understanding of discipleship, and a teaching/learning cycle compatible with ideology in Mediterranean society" (p. 209) as contrasted with the Gospels of Matthew and Luke, the reasons for whose preservation are easy to see in their distinctive qualities. This reviewer disagrees: Mark's Gospel was preserved because it was directly and explicitly about Jesus as the Son of God in an altogether distinctive sense. Not that Matthew and Luke didn't hold this same belief, but it is not the focus of their attention (cf. J. Swetnam, "No Sign of Jonah", *Bib* 66 [1985] 126-130).

This is a rewarding book. It is obviously the result of much intelligent

thought and study. Part of it sums up and re-presents the fruit of others' study, but always with attribution and always with integration into the author's own thought. As far as this reviewer is concerned, the book helps free New Testament criticism from the self-imposed strait jacket it has been in and opens the New Testament to a more nuanced approach. This is not to say that Robbins is equally successful throughout. The most convincing chapter is the second, in which he uses three-step progression to analyze Mark. He succeeds in showing that Mark consciously made use of such progressions, but there is more to be done before a structure can be presented for the Gospel as a whole in which all of Mark's principal consciously-used techniques have been rendered visible.

There is no doubt that Robbins has presented an intriguing, nay, fascinating set of criteria in his various "forms". In fact, they are so fascinating in their several separate existences and in their mutual interplay that they could easily become an object of study for their own sake, much as some modern art lends itself to study solely for the interplay of forms with no reference to content. To avoid this seduction some element should be incorporated in Robbins' set of critical tools which is focussed especially on content. The reviewer suggests the "analogy of faith" as such a tool, i.e., Christian tradition as a whole acting as a catalyst. Believing Christians (and possibly non-believers as well, if only by way of reaction) use the analogy of faith subconsciously when reading the New Testament. It is only being methodologically honest to recognize this fact and act accordingly.

Coming to grips with the New Testament text with regard to its allusions and underlying suppositions and other aspects is such an arduously difficult and problematic endeavor that any major contribution to the task, such as *Jesus the Teacher*, despite its limitations, is worthy of all praise. For we are all Spaniards reading texts in a distant land.

Pontifical Biblical Institute
Via della Pilotta, 25
00187 Rome

James SWETNAM S.J.

Raymond E. BROWN, S. S. – John P. MEIER, *Antioch and Rome. New Testament Cradles of Catholic Christianity*. XII-242. New York/Ramsey 1983. Paulist Press.

Con questo libro, due noti neotestamentaristi americani ci hanno offerto i risultati di una seducente impresa, che finora non era stata affrontata, ma la cui necessità era nell'aria, desiderata da ogni studioso delle origini cristiane. Essi vi tracciano l'evoluzione storica e teologica di due comunità cristiane fino agli inizi del II secolo, scandendo il tempo nell'arco di tre generazioni, rispettivamente contrassegnate dalla presenza dei primi apostoli (fino al 70), da quella dei loro discepoli (ca. 70-90) e infine dalla prima letteratura suba-

postolica (ca. 90-120). Una conclusione fondamentale del lavoro riguarda la mutevole e problematica relazione dei giudeo-cristiani ed etnico-cristiani nelle due città prese a campione nella ricerca. E perciò R. E. Brown premette una chiarificatrice Introduzione sulla complessità della situazione, per dire che nella predicazione ai Gentili il N.T. non conosce soltanto l'atteggiamento di Paolo, il quale è soltanto uno (= il terzo) di ben quattro gruppi, che vanno da un'estrema destra (= i Farisei convertiti di At 15,5 e i «falsi fratelli» di Gal 2,4) ad una posizione più moderata (rappresentata essenzialmente da Giacomo e Pietro), per giungere ad un'estrema sinistra (= gli Ellenisti di At 6,1-6; Ebr.; Gv). I quattro gruppi dovevano essere disseminati un pò dovunque nell'area mediterranea, creando confronti e conflitti all'interno delle singole comunità. Mi pare che il quadro proposto renda molto meglio conto della variegata situazione cristiana nel I secolo che non la semplicistica bipartizione corrente tra giudeo-cristianesimo e cristianesimo ellenistico; ma nell'esposizione delle pagine seguenti il cosiddetto secondo gruppo si rivelerà un pò eterogeneo, poiché a Pietro verrà riconosciuto un ruolo mediano, che mal si concilia con la sua associazione a Giacomo in questa precisazione iniziale. Per quanto riguarda Antiochia (pp. 11-86), J. P. Meier (il quale impropriamente a p. 12 n. 15 attribuisce la locuzione «la Grande Chiesa» ai *modern scholars*, essendo invece essa già attribuita a Celso da Origene, *C. Cels.* V 59) comincia col dimostrare che il Vangelo di Matteo è stato scritto in quella città. I motivi addotti sono buoni, ma purtroppo non è trattato il problema dell'eventuale lingua originale aramaica (cfr. pp. 19,23), forse dando per scontato ciò che probabilmente è vero (che cioè già il greco sia stata la lingua originale), ma la cui discussione poteva contribuire a illuminare la realtà socio-culturale siriano-antiochena. Egli cerca poi di fotografare il periodo della prima generazione sulla scorta di Gal 2 e At 11-15 e distingue la presenza ad Antiochia di un'ala sinistra (= gli etnico-cristiani favorevoli a Paolo) e di un'ala destra (= il gruppo giudeo-cristiano della parte di Giacomo, che per lungo tempo ebbe il sopravvento), tra le quali Pietro svolse una funzione mediatrice; la trattazione è forse un pò affrettata (per esempio, alle pp. 38-41 non è presa in considerazione la possibilità di un'inversione cronologica tra il concilio di Gerusalemme e il cosiddetto incidente di Antiochia). Della seconda generazione si fa portavoce Mt, che viene molto ben situato storicamente e teologicamente: forse la sezione migliore di questa prima parte del volume. Alla terza generazione appartiene Ignazio con le sue *Lettere*, il quale rappresenta uno stadio già molto evoluto, soprattutto circa la triplice struttura gerarchica della chiesa; ma, poiché l'A. ritiene che il cambiamento sia avvenuto sotto la spinta dello gnosticismo (p. 75), sarebbe stato auspicabile che si dilungasse maggiormente sulla complessità ed importanza di questo fenomeno. Solo secondariamente, com'era giusto, vien fatto cenno alla *Didaché*, a motivo dell'incertezza della sua datazione e collocazione geografica.

Quanto a Roma (pp. 87-116), R. E. Brown è autore di una lunga e attentissima analisi. Egli comincia col ricordare gli inizi oscuri ma sicuramente giudaici della chiesa romana; a p. 94 n. 193 mi attribuisce «the lowest count I have seen» degli ebrei a Roma nel I secolo (= 20.000 unità), ma in realtà nel mio articolo da lui benevolmente citato, io riporto anche (cfr. *NTS* 28 (1982) 341 n. 53) il calcolo proposto dalla *Encyclopedia Judaica* che computa

appena 10.000 unità; quanto al nome di *Chrestus*, per attestare che è romano, non è necessario trarre dal *CIL* un'iscrizione dell'anno 211 (= p. 100 n. 207), poiché già nel I secolo esso è attestato dal poeta Marziale, *Epigr.* VII 55,1; inoltre, andrebbe precisato che la dozzina di Sinagoghe testimoniate a Roma dalle epigrafi catacombali ebraiche (= p. 101) si riducono appena a cinque nel I secolo (cfr. *NTS*, *ib.*, p. 328); e purtroppo (cfr. p. 102) non viene discussa la possibilità che il provvedimento antiggiudaico dell'imperatore Claudio possa essere datato nel 41 invece che nel 49. Passando alla fine della prima generazione, il Brown prende in esame la Lettera ai Romani, di cui offre una buona trattazione, pertinente all'argomento, cioè ottimamente «situata» in rapporto all'imminente viaggio di Paolo a Gerusalemme e ai vincoli della comunità romana con quella chiesa; è interessante l'ipotesi che Paolo sia stato messo a morte per gelosia ed invidia (cfr. *1 Clem.* 5) dei giudeo-cristiani estremisti: ma allora come spiegare l'analoga sorte tragica di Pietro, che non era del gruppo paolino? Ciò che manca, inoltre, è una discussione dello spinoso problema della cronologia della vita di Paolo, in particolare della sua morte. Come esponenti della seconda generazione romana, l'A. lascia parlare la prima lettera di Pietro (pseudonima) e quella agli Ebrei (la cui tardiva fortuna nella chiesa di Roma viene suggestivamente spiegata per il fatto che le sue posizioni antiggiudaiche non la posero in buona luce davanti a quella comunità strettamente legata al giudaismo). La terza generazione è rappresentata dalla Lettera di Clemente ai Corinzi, in cui è evidente una eredità giudeo-ellenistica (in senso conservatore) e in particolare una concezione della gerarchia ecclesiastica molto più vicina a quella giudaica (e anche imperiale) che non ai precedenti scritti Rom e 1 Pt. In un ultimo capitolo, quasi in appendice, vengono brevemente discussi altri possibili documenti attinenti alla chiesa di Roma: Fil; Ef; Mc; Ignazio, *ad Rom*; *Past. Herm.*; leggende di Pietro e Simon Mago; 2 Pt.

Questa rapida rassegna del volume non rende certamente conto della sua notevole ricchezza di dati, di intuizioni, di discussione, e anche di risultati. Non esiterei a dire che siamo di fronte a qualcosa di geniale. Certo, la ricostruzione è basata su scelte di fonti non sempre matematicamente sicure: così in parte Mt per Antiochia e soprattutto Ebr per Roma. Ma mi rendo conto che bisognava pur prendere posizione; e, tutto sommato, l'operazione porta a conclusioni sostanzialmente credibili. Merito principale di un tale lavoro è di aiutare a situare storicamente gli scritti del NT: non tanto ciascuno per conto suo, bensì ciascuno in rapporto agli altri, come parti di un quadro più generale. Inoltre, esso sottolinea con forza che il NT non è soltanto una raccolta letteraria di astratto valore dogmatico, ma anche e forse soprattutto una storia concreta e complessa di una confessione di fede, recepita e vissuta diversamente da vari gruppi cristiani e in cangianti momenti e situazioni. In più viene presupposta e valorizzata una feconda continuità documentaria tra il NT e il periodo subapostolico, pur nella constatazione di una certa discontinuità in alcuni temi, secondo una dialettica che è superata dalla vitalità della stessa singola comunità cristiana in crescita. Ambedue gli Autori, poi, mettono in luce il ruolo mediano giocato da Pietro tra le opposte correnti del cristianesimo primitivo, aprendo così il discorso su una dimensione di attualità, che non va considerata soltanto di parte cattolica.

Sicché, le osservazioni critiche che abbiamo esposto non riescono ad infirmare la validità di un'opera assolutamente interessante, sia nel metodo che nei risultati. C'è da augurarsi che ricerche del genere vengano applicate anche ad altri casi, come Gerusalemme e ancor più Efeso. Sarebbero altrettante pennellate per completare, anzi riportare alla luce secondo un paziente lavoro di restauro, il quadro completo del cristianesimo delle origini. Le esperienze non sono certo senza impatto sulla complessa vita ecclesiale odierna.

Via Aurelia Antica 284
00165 Roma

Romano PENNA

François REFOULÉ, "...*Et ainsi tout Israël sera sauvé*": *Romains 11,25-32* (Lectio divina 117). 292 p. 21,3×13,4. Paris 1984. Les Éditions du Cerf.

A great variety of exegetical interpretations of Paul's prophecy in Rom 11,26 that "all Israel will be saved" have existed through the ages. By associating "all Israel" with "the Israel of God" of Gal 6,16 St. Augustine (*Ep.* 149,19) concluded that Paul made reference in 11,26 to the salvation of all those Jews and Gentiles whom God had predestined. This viewpoint remained dominant through many centuries but then began to be replaced by an interpretation of "all Israel" as the historical people of Israel, the nation as a whole. Some then drew the conclusion that Paul optimistically spoke of the salvation of all Jews down through the ages. The problem here, however, is that Paul himself assumed that Christ's Parousia was close at hand. He could hardly then have anticipated so many further generations of Jews. But did Paul expect even that all of the Jews of his own age would be saved? A continuous debate has raged back and forth over this point. For his part, Paul had hopes of being an instrument of salvation only for "some" Jews (Rom 11,14). Then too, it is also true that "all Israel" in its Biblical usage can refer only to a representative group rather than to each and every individual Israelite. Yet if the prophecy is limited to too small a group, it becomes in context either anti-climactic or even tautological.

François Refoulé, currently the director of the École Biblique in Jerusalem, takes up this whole problem anew in his book and urges strongly an interpretation advanced only occasionally in previous discussions of Rom 9-11. "All Israel" in Rom 11,26 - and the term "Israel" generally in Rom 9-11 - must refer, he argues, not to the nation as a whole but only to the "Remnant" or the "elect". This position he defends in the course of a detailed verse-by-verse analysis of Rom 11,25-32, an analysis which offers him opportunity to say a good deal about Rom 9-11 as a whole.

In apocalyptic fashion Rom 11,25 sets forth, according to R., a divine "mystery" or revealed event of the End Time: the hardening of Israel "for a

time" – R. interprets *apo merous* in this sense rather than as "in part" – will come to an end when the *plērōma* of the Gentiles has entered in. The "mystery" in this case is not the hardening of Israel, an obvious fact for Paul and his fellow Christians, but the time-limit placed on the hardening – it is not to be permanent. Here in 11,25, says R., Paul has actually made use of a tradition closely connected to Mark 13,10 ("It is necessary that the Gospel first be proclaimed to all the nations"). Rom 11,26 represents Paul's own comment on this tradition. However, the "Israel" that Paul speaks of cannot be the historical nation of Israel but must instead be the Israel of the election, i.e., the "Remnant" of "pious Jews" that existed prior to and at the time of the preaching of the Gospel. Paul, argues R., could have ascribed "glory" and "sonship" (Rom 9,4) only to this group, and only this group actually "sought after a law of righteousness" (9,31) and was "zealous" for God (10,2). In short, only this group, and not all Jews generally, was "Israel". Those described by Paul as "hardened" (11,7), those, that is, who had stumbled against the stone that is Christ (9,32), came, R. insists, from "Israel", i.e., precisely from this elect Remnant. It was because Paul believed that these people were among the elect that he concluded that they would convert to Christianity before Christ's Parousia.

R. speaks deliberately of a "conversion", a coming to faith in Jesus. Paul, he says, "never envisaged even the possibility that Israel might be able to attain to salvation without faith" (189).

While it is true that in Rom 9–11 the term "Israel" is used at times with enough ambiguity so as to admit its equation with "the elect", its use in Rom 11,7 ("What Israel is seeking, it has not obtained. The elect (*eklogē*) indeed have obtained it but the rest (*hoi loipoi*) have been hardened.") seems unequivocal. R. attempts here to equate "Israel" and the *eklogē*, but the text quite clearly supposes that Israel is made up of two groups, the "elect" and "the others" who have been hardened. The term "Israel" therefore appears to encompass a much larger group of people than R. is prepared to admit. To be sure, R. is correct in noting that the specific reference in Rom 11,26 to "all Israel" can refer just to a representative group that stands for the whole nation (see, e.g., 1 Sam 7,5; 25,1; 2 Sam 10,17; etc.). But nothing in the text excludes the possibility that Paul encompassed under the designation "Israel" a group much more closely coextensive with the number of Jews living before and during his time. Paul certainly held out hope for "the rest", however many they might be.

R. also is incorrect in supposing that for Paul faith is the only means of salvation. In the famous case of the so-called "Pauline privilege" in 1 Cor 7, in a marriage between a Christian and a non-Christian not only the children but even the pagan spouse are somehow "sanctified" and made "holy" (7,14). The Pauline teaching that in marital union "the two become one flesh" and "one body" (1 Cor 6,16) makes such an extension of Christian sanctification a logical corollary even though in the situation described in 1 Cor 7 there is no supposition whatever that the pagan spouse has come to active faith. In his stress on faith as an absolute necessity, R. risks in my judgment turning it into a kind of "work" that is a meritorious requisite for salvation. However strongly Paul emphasizes faith in Rom 9–11, he even

more strongly emphasizes God's sovereignty and free determination. Thus, if for Paul faith indeed is the ordinary means to salvation, God still is able to sanctify individuals in other ways.

A significant shortcoming of this book is that it says nothing about the broader context in which Rom 11,25-32 was composed. The Letter to the Romans is Paul's *apologia pro vita sua*, his defense of his Gospel. Whatever the particular ethnic make-up of the Roman church – and it is likely that it did include a fair number of people of non-Jewish origin – this community clearly viewed itself as a part of Israel and as the heirs of all of God's covenantal promises to Israel. In writing Rom Paul seems to have supposed that this church may have harbored suspicions about his own fidelity to Biblical revelation. Certainly he is at pains to demonstrate in the letter that he is no renegade from Israel. Rather, he argues, he takes the Biblical promises extremely seriously and preaches a Gospel that is fully congruent with the Scriptures.

Rom 9-11 stands squarely within this Biblical perspective. If his opponents have argued that his Gospel represented a *de facto* nullification of God's saving promises to Israel (Gentiles are to be saved while Jews are to be rejected), Paul's response is that everything that has happened to the Jews has been foretold in the Scriptures. Nevertheless, despite the present difficulties experienced by his fellow Israelites with respect to the Gospel, God can and will remain faithful to his promise of ultimate salvation for Israel. Given this apologetic context for Paul's remarks, it is difficult to imagine that Paul spoke only of the salvation of a very limited number of Jews. The widely held theory that "all Israel" in Rom 11,26 refers to "the nation Israel as a whole, but not necessarily including every individual member" (C. E. B. Cranfield) corresponds better to the overall thrust of Paul's response to his critics than does R.'s rather restricted understanding of this phrase.

Does Rom 11,25-32 lend support to a more optimistic assessment of the possibilities for salvation of present-day Jews? R. is of course quite right in saying that Paul could not have made any explicit reference to generations so far removed from his own time. If, then, Rom 11,26 must be restricted in its explicit import to Paul's own generation, Paul's general optimism in Rom 9-11 about God's ultimate covenantal fidelity and saving mercy remains an important scriptural datum at the hermeneutical level for evaluating the present-day relationship of the Jewish people to the Lord.

In short, where R. tends to restrict and contain Israel's possibilities for salvation, Paul himself appears in fact to have opened these up and expanded them. Without question R.'s book is provocative and stimulating at many points. I am not convinced, however, that R. has carried his case in urging the interpretation of Rom 9-11 that he does.

Theology Department
Loyola University
Chicago, IL 60626 USA

Robert A. WILD, S.J.

NUNTII PERSONARUM ET RERUM

Colloquium Biblicum Lovaniense

The Colloquium Biblicum Lovaniense XXXV will be held at Leuven in 1985, 27-29 August. The subject of the Colloquium is: Ezekiel and His Book.

For further information please contact Prof. J. Lust, St.-Michielsstraat 2-6, B-3000 Leuven.

Registration and accomodation: Secretariate Colloquium Biblicum Lovaniense, Paus Adriaan VI-College, Hogeschoolplein 3, B-3000 Leuven.

Pontificium Institutum Biblicum Annus academicus 1984-1985. I semestre

Auditores inscripti erant 292, qui in diversas categorias sic distribuebantur:

	Ad Doctoratum	Ad Licentiam	Hospites	Universi
Fac. Biblica	12	255	22	289
Fac. Orientalista	1	1	2	3
Universi	13	256	23	292
Nationes	57	Alumni		292
Dioceses	156	Alumni		157
Inst. Religiosorum	41	Alumni		110
Inst. Religiosarum	9	Alumnae		9
Ex statu laicali	16	Alumnae		9
		Alumni		7

Laureae

Laurea in Re Biblica digni declarati sunt:

DE BAAR, Henri J., C. M. (25.V.1984). *L'influence du livre de Daniel sur l'Apocalypse de Jean* (Magna cum laude). Moderator: I. DE LA POTTERIE.

BRETÓN, Santiago, S. J. (8.VI.1984). *Formulario profético de vocación y misión* (Cum laude). Moderator: L. ALONSO SCHÖKEL.

MEAGHER, Patrick M., S. J. (15.VI.1984). *Faith Active through Agape (Gal 5,6). A Study of the Formation of a Christian Community of Agape According to the Letter to the Galatians* (Magna cum laude). Moderator: F. LENTZEN-DEIS.

Doctor in Re Biblica renuntiatus est, typis edita thesi:

GRAFFY, Adrian, *A Prophet Confronts his People. The Disputation Speech in the Prophets* (Analecta Biblica 104). 148 p. Rome 1984. Biblical Institute Press.

LIBRI AD DIRECTIONEM MISSI

Omnes libri ad Directionem missi quodam modo cum rebus biblicis connexi in hoc elencho notantur. Praeterea mandantur redactori *Elenchi bibliographici biblici* et in eodem *Elencho bibliographico* notantur prout redactori bonum videtur.

Eo autem quod hi libri in *Biblica* recipiuntur, nullum de iis exprimitur iudicium.

Recensiones de libris aut fient aut non fient, prout Moderatori recensio-num opportunum videbitur.

Libri ad Directionem missi, quos Directio periodici non directe recensio-nis gratia expetiverit, numquam remittuntur, etsi de eis recensio non fit.

Libri mittantur ad «Directio *Biblica*, Pontificium Institutum Biblicum, Via della Pilotta 25, I-00187 Roma, Italia.

Novum Testamentum

Adinolfi (*et alii*), *Gesù Apostolo e Sommo Sacerdote*. Studi biblici in memoria di P. Teodorico Ballarini. xx-234 p. 24,4 × 17. Casale Monferrato 1984. Marietti. Lit. 23.000.

Boinnard, Y. (*et alii*), *Mort de Jésus*. Dossier pour l'animation biblique (Essais Bibliques 8). 141 p. 21 × 14,8. Genève 1984. Labor et Fides.

Brown, Colin, *Miracles and the Critical Mind*. 383 p. 23,5 × 15,9. Exeter 1984. The Paternoster Press – Eerdmans. £14,20.

Brown, Raymond E., *The Churches the Apostles Left Behind*. 156 p. 21 × 14,2. New York – Ramsey 1984. Paulist Press. US \$8.95.

Collins, Raymond R. F., *Studies on the First Letter to the Thessalonians* (Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium LXVI). x-418 p. 24,2 × 15,9. Leuven 1984. University Press – Peeters. FB 1.500.

Chevallier, M.-A., *L'exégèse du Nouveau Testament*. Initiation à la méthode. 124 p. 22,5 × 14,8. Genève 1984. Labor et Fides.

Corsini, Eugenio, *L'Apocalypse maintenant*. Traduit de l'italien par Renza Arrighi (Parole de Dieu). 342 p. 20,5 × 14. Paris 1984. Editions du Seuil. FF 110.

Dauer, Anton, *Johannes und Lukas*. Untersuchungen zu den johanneisch-lukanischen Paralleelperikopen: Joh 4,46-54/Lk 7,1-10 – Joh 12,1-8/Lk 7,36-50; 10,38-42 – Joh 20,19-29/Lk 24,36-49 (Forschung zur Bibel 50). 505 p. 23,3 × 15,3. Würzburg 1984. Echter. DM 56,—.

Francis, Fred O., – Sampley, J. Paul, (Eds.), *Pauline Parallels* (New Testament Foundations and Facets). 416 p. 24,2 × 21,3. Philadelphia, PA 1984. Fortress Press. US \$29.95.

Frankemölle, Hubert, *Jahwe-Bund und Kirche Christi*. Studien zur Form und Traditionsgeschichte des Evangeliums nach Matthäus (Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen 10). xx-429 p. 23,9 × 16. Münster 1984.

Grelot, Pierre, *Évangiles et tradition apostolique*. Réflexions sur un certain «Christ hébreu» (Théologies/Apologues). 176 p. 23,5 × 14,5. Paris 1984. Le Cerf. FF. 75.

Haenchen, Ernst, John I. *A Commentary on the Gospel of John Chapters 1–6*. Translated by R. W. Funk (Hermeneia). xxx-308 p. 24,1 × 21,5. Philadelphia 1984. Fortress Press.

Hollenweger, Walter J., *Conflitto a Corinto* (I Corinzi 12-14). *Ricordi di un anziano* (Ezechiele 37). *Esperienze ad Efeso*. *Racconti di uno scampato* (Genesi 8,15-22; Giovanni 6,1-15; Apocalisse 21,1-6). *Saggi di interpretazione narrativa della Bibbia* (Piccola Collana Moderna, Serie Biblica 46). 127 p. 19,9 × 12. Torino 1984. Claudiana Editrice. Lit. 7.200.

Hübner, Hans, *Gottes Ich und Israel*. Zum Schriftgebrauch des Paulus in Römer 9–11 (FRLANT 136). 171 p. 23,2 × 15. Göttingen 1984. Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. DM 38.

Kennedy, George A., *New Testament Interpretation through Rhetorical Criticism* (Studies in Religion). viii-171 p. 21 × 13,4. London – Chapel Hill 1984. The University of North Carolina Press. US \$9.05.

Lambrecht, Jan, *Ich aber sage euch*. *Die Bergpredigt als programmatische Rede Jesu* (Mt 5–7; Lk 6,20-49). 252 p. 21,9 × 13,5. Stuttgart 1984. Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk. DM 32,—.

Longenecker, Richard N., *New Testament Social Ethics for Today*. xiii-108 p. 21 × 13,3. Exeter 1984. The Paternoster Press.

Luedemann, Gerd, *Paul Apostle to the Gentiles*. Studies in Chronology. Translated by F. Stanley Jones. xxii-311 p. 23 × 16. Philadelphia 1984. Fortress Press.

Medala, Stanisław – Frankowski, Janusz, *Funkcja chrystologiczno-eklezjologiczna dialogów Jezusa z żydami w czwartej Ewangelii*. — *Nurty i kierunki rozwoju nowotestamentalnej myśli chrystologicznej w świetle Hebr 1,3*. (Studia z Biblistyki Tom IV). 376 p. 23,9 × 16,7. Warszawa 1984. Akademia Teologii Katolickiej.

Morrice, William G., *Joy in the New Testament*. 173 p. 21,7 × 14,1. Exeter 1984. The Paternoster Press. £4.95.

Neiryneck, F., – van Segbroeck, F., *New Testament Vocabulary*. *A Companion Volume to the Concordance* (Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum

Lovaniensium LXV). xv-494 p. 24,3 × 16. Leuven 1984. University Press - Uitgeverij Peeters. FB 2.000.

Osiek, Carolyn, *What Are They Saying about the Social Setting of the New Testament?* 93 p. 20,3 × 19,6. New York - Ramsey 1984. Paulist Press. US \$3.95.

Panier, Louis, *Récit et commentaires de la tentation de Jésus au désert. Approche sémiotique du discours interprétatif (Thèses)*. v-379 p. 23,8 × 15,6. Paris 1984. Le Cerf. FF 129.

Pesch, Rudolf, *L'evangelo della comunità primitiva (Studi Biblici 68)*. 218 p. 20,8 × 13,8. Brescia 1984. Paideia Editrice Lit. 15.000.

Vetus Testamentum

Alonso Schökel, L. - Sicre Díaz, J. L., *I Profeti. Traduzione et commento (Commenti Biblici)*. 1566 p. 23,6 × 15,5. Roma 1984. Edizioni Borla.

Alonso Schökel, L. - Vilchez Lindes, J., *Proverbios (Sapienciales 1)*. 603 p. 24,2 × 15,7. Madrid 1984. Ediciones Cristiandad.

Barrick, W. B. - Spencer, J. R. (Eds.), *In the Shelter of Elyon. Essays on Ancient Palestinian Life and Literature in Honor of G. W. Ahlström (JSOT Supplement Series 31)*. 330 p. 21,1 × 14. Sheffield 1984. JSOT Press. US \$35.00.

Bazak, Jacob, *Structures and Contents in the Psalms. Geometric Structural Patterns in the Seven Alphabetic Psalms*. 180 p. 22,8 × 15,5. Tel Aviv 1984. DVIR Publishing House.

Bellinger, Psalmody and Prophecy (JSOT Supplement Series 27). 146 p. 21,3 × 13,3. Sheffield 1984. JSOT Press. US \$11.95.

Bergant, Dianne, *What Are They Saying About Wisdom Literature?* 96 p. 20,3 × 13,5. New York - Ramsey, N.J. 1984. Paulist Press. US \$3.95.

Bizzeti, Paolo, *Il Libro della Sapienza. Struttura e genere letterario (Associazione Biblica Italiana. Supplementi alla Rivista Biblica 11)*. 190 p. 24 × 16,8. Brescia 1984. Paideia. Lit. 10.000.

Blenkinsopp, Joseph, *A History of Prophecy in Israel. From the Settlement in the Land to the Hellenistic Period*. 287 p. 21,5 × 13,5. London 1984. SPCK. £9.50.

Blocher, Henri, *La creazione. L'inizio della Genesi*. 346 p. 21 × 13,4. Roma 1984. Edizioni G.B.U. Lit. 16.400.

Buber, Martin, *Der Glaube der Propheten. (Verbesserte und um Register ergänzte Auflage)*. 312 p. 23,5 × 14,6. Heidelberg 1984. Verlag Lambert Schneider. DM 48,—.

Clifford, Richard J., *Fair Spoken and Persuading. An Interpretation of Second Isaiah* (Theological Inquiries Series). v-202 p. 20,3 × 13,5. Ramsey, N.J. 1984. Paulist Press. US \$8.95.

Cody, Aelred, *Ezekiel with an Excursus on Old Testament Priesthood* (Old Testament Message 11). 270 p. 21 × 13,3. Wilmington, DL 1984. Michael Glazier. US \$9.95.

Cohen, Chaim - Sivan, Daniel, *The Ugaritic Hippiatric Texts: A Critical Edition* (American Oriental Series Essay 9). 72 p. 25,5 × 17,1. New Haven, Conn 1983. American Oriental Society. US \$12.50.

Clines, David J. A., *The Esther Scroll. The Story of the Story* (JSOT Supplement Series 30). 260 p. 21,5 × 13,5. Sheffield 1984. JSOT Press. US \$13.50.

Díez Macho, A., *Apócrifos del Antiguo Testamento* II. 525 p. Tomo III. 398 p. Tomo IV. 342 p. 24 × 15,7. Madrid 1984. Ediciones Cristiandad.

Eissfeldt, Otto, *Introduzione all'Antico Testamento. Volume IV. Il canone e il testo* (Biblioteca teologica 4). 349 p. 22,7 × 15,6. Brescia 1984. Paideia Editrice. Lit. 28.000.

Estin, Colette, *Les psautiers de Jérôme à la lumière des traductions juives antérieures* (Collectanea Biblica Latina XV). 238 p. 24,4 × 17. Roma 1984. San Girolamo.

Ferch, Arthur J., *The Son of Man in Daniel 7* (Doctoral Dissertation Series VI). x-237 p. 22,8 × 15. Berrian Springs, MI 1984. Andrews University Press.

Fernández Marcos, N. - Treballe Barrera, J. - Fernández Vallina, J. (Eds.), *Simposio Bíblico Español* (Salamanca 1982). 772 p. 24 × 16,8. Madrid 1984. Universidad Complutense.

Foresti, Fabrizio, *The Rejection of Saul in the Perspective of the Deuteronomistic School. A Study of 1 Sm 15 and Related Texts* (Studia Theologica. Teresianum 5). 204 p. 21 × 15,5. Roma 1984. Edizioni del Teresianum.

Fuhs, Hans Ferdinand, *Ezekiel 1-24* (Die Neue Echter Bibel Kommentar zum Alten Testament). Herausgegeben von Weihbischof Dr. Josef Plöger, Köln und Professor Dr. Josef Schreiner. 136 S. 15,5 × 23,5. Würzburg 1984. Echter. DM 24,—.

Gnuse, Robert Karl, *The Dream Theophany of Samuel. Its Structure in Relation to Ancient Near Eastern Dreams and Its Theological Significance*. XIII-264 p. 22,8 × 14,9. Lanham - New York - London 1984. University Press of America. US \$13.50.

Gordon, R. P., *1 & 2 Samuel* (Old Testament Guides 2). 102 p. 21,3 × 13,5. Ramsey, N.J. 1984. Paulist Press. US \$6.95.

Hackett, Jo Ann, *The Balaam Text From deir 'Allā* (Harvard Semitic Monographs 31). xi-147 p. 22,2 × 14,2. Chico, CA 1984. Scholars Press. US \$11.95.

Haglund, Erik, *Historical Motifs in the Psalms* (Coniectanea Biblica Old Testament Series 23). 144 p. 23,5 × 15,5. Lund 1984. Gleerup.

Hengel, Martin, *Il figlio di Dio. L'origine della cristologia e la storia della religione giudeo-ellenistica* (Studi Biblici 67). 139 p. 20,8 × 13,8. Brescia 1984. Paideia Editrice. Lit. 12.000.

Hillers, Delbert R., *Micah. A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Micah* (Hermeneia). xviii-116 p. 24,2 × 21,3. Philadelphia 1984. Fortress Press.

Irsigler, Hubert, *Psalm 73 — Monolog eines Weisen*. Text, Program, Struktur (Arbeiten zu Text und Sprache im Alte Testament 20). xii-404 S. 21 × 14,5. St. Ottilien 1983. EOS Verlag. DM 40,—.

Jensen, Joseph, *Isaiah 1-39* (Old Testament Message 8). 311 p. 21 × 13,3. Wilmington, DL 1984. Michael Glazier. US \$9.95.

Kaiser, Otto, *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*. Eine Einführung in ihre Ergebnisse und Probleme (Grundlegend neubearbeitete Auflage). 404 S. 23 × 15,2. Gütersloh 1984. Gütersloher Verlagshaus — Gerd Mohn. DM. 58,—.

Kaiser, Walter C., *Toward Old Testament Ethics*. xii-345 p. 24 × 16. Grand Rapids, MI 1983. Zondervan Publishing House.

Long, O. Burke, *I Kings with an Introduction to Historical Literature* (The Forms of the Old Testament Literature IX). xv-265 p. 22,8 × 15,1. Exeter 1984. The Paternoster Press. £18.60.

Loretz, Oswald, *Psalm 29. Kanaanäische El- und Baaltraditionen in jüdischer Sicht* (Ugaritisch-Biblische Literatur). 168 p. 20,9 × 14,8. Altenberge 1984. CIS Verlag. DM 49,80.

Loretz, Oswald, *Habiru-Hebräer*. Eine sozio-linguistische Studie über die Herkunft des Gentiliziums *ibrit* vom Appellativum *habiru*. xv-314 p. 23,5 × 15,8. Berlin - New York 1984. Walter de Gruyter.

Neveu, Louis, *Avant Abraham (Genèse I-XI)*. Recherches sur les procédés de composition bibliques. 238 p. 29 × 20,6. Angers 1984. Université Catholique de l'Ouest. FF 95.

Peláez del Rosal, Jesús, *De Abrahán a Maimónides I*. Los orígenes del pueblo hebreo (Estudios de Cultura Hebrea 1). 235 p. 21 × 13,8. Córdoba 1984. Ediciones El Almendro.

Perdue, L. G. — Kovacs, B. W. (eds.), *A Prophet to the Nations*. Essays in Jeremiah Studies. xvi-399 p. 23,5 × 15,7. Winona Lake, IN 1984. Eisenbrauns. \$25.00.

Refoulé, François, «... *Et ainsi tout Israël sera sauvé*». Romains 11,25-32 (Lectio Divina 116). 292 p. 21,5×13,6. Paris 1984. Le Cerf. FF. 133.

Steingrímsson, Sigurdur Orn, *Tor der Gerechtigkeit*. Eine literaturwissenschaftliche Untersuchung der sogenannten EinzugsLiturgien im AT: Ps 15; 24,3-5 und Jes 33,14-16 (Arbeiten zu Text und Sprache im Alten Testament 22). xiv-188 S. 21×14,5. St. Ottilien 1984. EOS Verlag. DM 32,—.

Théodoret de Cyr, *Commentaire sur Isaïe*. Tome III (Sections 14-20). Texte critique, traduction, notes et index par Jean-Noël Guinot (Sources Chrétiennes 315). 460 p. 19,5×12,5. Paris 1984. Le Cerf. FF 380.

VanderKam, James C., *Enoch and the Growth of an Apocalyptic Tradition* (The Catholic Quarterly Monograph Series 16). x-217 p. 22,8×15,8. Washington, DC 1984. The Catholic Biblical Association of America.

Vanoni, Gottfried, *Literarkritik und Grammatik*. Untersuchung der Wiederholungen und Spannungen in 1 Kön 11-12 (Arbeiten zu Text und Sprache im Alten Testament 21). 316 S. 21×14,5. St. Ottilien 1984. EOS Verlag. DM 39,—.

Weiser, Artur, *I Salmi*. Parte prima: Ps 1-60. 467 p. Parte seconda: Ps 61-150. p. 489-963 (Antico Testamento 15). Traduzione ed edizione italiana a cura di Tommaso Federici. Brescia 1984. Paideia Editrice. Lit. 60.000.

Westermann, Claus, *Genesis 1-11. A Commentary*. Translated by John J. Scullion S.J. xii-636 p. 24×17,5. Minneapolis, MN 1984. Augsburg. US \$29.95.

Wiklander, Bertil, *Prophecy as Literature*. A Text-Linguistic and Rhetorical Approach to Isaiah 2-4 (Coniectanea Biblica Old Testament Series 22). xiii-278. 23,5×15,5. Lund 1984. CWK Gleerup.

ISSN 0006-0887

PIETRO BOCCACCIO, Direttore Responsabile

Autorizz. Tribunale di Roma n. 6229 del 24-3-1958 del Reg. della Stampa

TIPOGRAFIA POLIGLOTTA DELLA PONTIFICIA UNIVERSITÀ GREGORIANA
PIAZZA DELLA PILOTTA, 4 - ROMA - Gennaio 1985